

SENATE

FRIDAY, AUGUST 13, 1965

(Legislative day of Thursday, August 12, 1965)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL, a Senator from the State of California.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who putteth down the mighty from their seats and exalteth the humble, by whom the meek are guided in judgment and light riseth up in darkness for the godly, in Thy providence we have come in these epochal days to the very vestibule of destiny.

Grant us in all our doubts and uncertainties the grace to ask what Thou wouldst have us to do, that the spirit of wisdom may save us from all false choices, and that in Thy light we may see light, and in Thy straight path may not stumble.

Upon the President of the United States and his counselors, the Vice President and Members of the Congress, upon the leaders of our Armed Forces, and upon all trusted with authority, on whose shoulders rest the heavy burdens and responsibilities for vital decisions so largely molding the years to be, and for weal or woe affecting the lives of untold millions, we implore the wisdom which is from above as against the forces that defile and degrade human life, in the name of the Lord our God we set up our banners, marching on even toward stern and bitter days—if such be our lot—with the assurance that as we fight to make men free, we march with Thee.

In the Redeemer's name, and in His spirit we pray. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., August 13, 1965.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL, a Senator from the State of California, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. KUCHEL thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1648) to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in eco-

nomically distressed areas and regions, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.J. Res. 4. Joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning September 13, 1965, as "National Literacy Week," and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 401. Joint resolution requesting the President to designate November 23, 1965, as Repudiation Day.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 448) to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating September 3, 1965, as Crusade for Safety Day, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following joint resolutions were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

H.J. Res. 4. Joint resolution designating the 6-day period beginning September 13, 1965, as "National Literacy Week," and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 401. Joint resolution requesting the President to designate November 23, 1965, as Repudiation Day.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 448) to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating September 3, 1965, as Crusade for Safety Day, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CORRECTION OF CERTAIN ERRORS IN THE TARIFF SCHEDULES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7969) to correct certain errors in the tariff schedules of the United States.

CORRECTION IN PRINTING OF AMENDMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield one-half minute to the Senator from Connecticut.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for one-half minute.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, due to an inadvertence, when amendment No. 385 was printed, my name was omitted. I ask unanimous consent that my

name be added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 385 with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the bill I yield myself 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce and the Subcommittee on Retirement of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Marine Corps.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORP.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William H. Hagerty, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the board of directors of the Communications Satellite Corp. for the remainder of the term expiring at the date of the annual meeting of the corporation in 1967.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army, placed on the Secretary's desk.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations placed on the Secretary's desk, in the Army, be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the nominations on the Executive Calendar. The nominations in the diplomatic and Foreign Service placed on the Secretary's desk still remain on the calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that calendar measures Nos. 555, 556, and 557 be considered in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will state the first measure to which the Senator from Montana has referred.

STUDY BY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS RELATING TO EFFICIENCY AND ECONOMY OF OPERATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT

The resolution (S. Res. 135) authorizing the Committee on Government Operations to make certain studies as to the efficiency and economy of the operations of the Government was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 135

Resolved, That S. Res. 54, Eighty-ninth Congress, first session, agreed to February 8, 1965, is amended by striking out the amount "\$435,000" on page 6, line 4, and inserting in lieu thereof the amount "\$465,000".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 572), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 135 would increase by \$30,000, from \$435,000 to \$465,000, the expenditure authorization of Senate Resolution 54, agreed to February 8, 1965, for use by the Committee on Government Operations (acting through its Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations), from January 1, 1965, through January 31, 1966, to make investigations into the efficiency and economy of operations of all branches of the Government.

During the 2d session of the 88th Congress, the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to expend \$450,000 for the same purpose.

STUDY OF MATTERS PERTAINING TO ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The resolution (S. Res. 136) to provide funds for the study of matters pertaining to economy and efficiency of foreign assistance activities by the Federal Government was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 136

Resolved, That section 4 of S. Res. 58, Eighty-ninth Congress, first session, authorizing funds for the study of matters pertaining to economy and efficiency of foreign assistance activities by the Federal Government, agreed to on February 8, 1965, be amended by striking out "57,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "91,500".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 573), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 136 would increase by \$34,000, from \$57,500 to \$91,500, the expenditure authorization of Senate Resolution 58, agreed to February 8, 1965, for use by the Committee on Government Operations (acting through its Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures), from February 1, 1965, through January 31, 1966, to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to the operation of foreign assistance activities by the Federal Government with a view to determining the economy and efficiency of such activities.

The present authorization of \$57,500 is one-half of the budget approved last session for the former Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, which has now been divided into Subcommittees on Foreign Aid Expenditures and on Executive Reorganization.

STUDY AND EVALUATION OF EFFECTS OF LAWS PERTAINING TO PROPOSED REORGANIZATIONS IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

The resolution (S. Res. 137) to provide funds to study and evaluate the effects of laws pertaining to proposed reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 137

Resolved, That section 4 of S. Res. 56, Eighty-ninth Congress, first session, authorizing funds to study and evaluate the effects of laws pertaining to proposed reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government, agreed to on February 8, 1965, be amended by striking out "\$57,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$88,000".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 574), explaining the purposes of the resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 137 would increase by \$30,500 from \$57,500 to \$88,000, the expenditure authorization of Senate Resolution 56,

agreed to February 8, 1965, for use by the Committee on Government Operations (acting through its Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization), from February 1, 1965, through January 31, 1966, to make a full and complete study for the purpose of evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the executive branch of the Government, and to consider reorganizations proposed therein.

The present authorization of \$57,000 is one-half of the budget approved last session for the former Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, which has now been divided into Subcommittees on Executive Reorganization and on Foreign Aid Expenditures.

CORRECTION OF CERTAIN ERRORS IN THE TARIFF SCHEDULES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7969) to correct certain errors in the tariff schedules of the United States.

BRITAIN'S ECONOMIC IMPROVEMENT VITAL TO U.S. INTERESTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator in charge of the bill yield 3 minutes under the bill to me to speak on two subjects?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] delivered a major speech proposing a series of specific steps to assist our great ally Britain in her hour of economic need.

Last night's Washington Star carries an article by Max Freedman which spells out precisely why the Javits speech is so timely, and why the vital interests of this country are so closely tied with the well-being of Britain.

Freedman shows just how the economic straits suffered by Britain have compelled her to reduce her defense establishment as part of her program for improving her balance of payments.

Freedman reports that the present reductions by the British in their defense effort are large, but unfortunately they are likely to be followed by additional defense cutbacks.

Obviously, a Britain that is fighting for freedom in Malaysia and defending the free world elsewhere cannot reduce her defense commitment without serious repercussion on her partner—this country.

Freedman asks:

Who except the United States, already overextended and reluctant to assume new duties, will fill the areas of weakness if a British retreat becomes unavoidable?

Who, indeed, Mr. President? A British cutback means either a retreat for freedom or a further involvement in the world's defense.

Those in the Senate and elsewhere who have been complaining about this country's overcommitment should consider carefully the constructive proposals of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], as set forth yesterday, and recognize the urgency of assisting a gallant and beleaguered ally in its time of trouble.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Max Freedman to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITISH ARMS CUTS A U.S. PROBLEM

(By Max Freedman)

The United States has a direct and painful interest in the defense reductions ordered by the Labor government in Britain. Those reductions have been imposed very reluctantly and only under the pressure of economic necessity. But the stark fact remains that more economies will be ordered unless the British people speedily improve their balance of payments.

As announced by Defense Secretary Denis Healey, the present reductions, though large, are not the end of the story. They are to be followed by other reductions in a program of planned economies.

It is a most disturbing fact, for all who value Britain's place as a world power, to learn from Healey that Iraq, Egypt, and Indonesia all have many modern weapons now surpassing those in the British arsenal. The United States can fight a war in Vietnam with its left hand; but a full-scale war in Malaysia would absorb the total fighting strength of the British people. How long can Britain remain a nuclear power while she is oppressed by these economic problems? And who except the United States, already overextended and reluctant to assume new duties, will fill the areas of weakness if a British retreat becomes unavoidable? These are policy questions now being weighed in the highest circles in Washington.

The interim program calls for a saving of \$600 million by drastic economies that do not invade existing defense commitments. The next stage requires a similar saving; and a few believe this can be done without some British commitments being scrapped. Defense expenditures next year will be \$280 million below the first estimates of the Labor government and \$320 million below the projected expenditures of the Conservative government. The objective for 1969-70 is a reduction in defense spending from 7 to 6 percent of the gross national product even though that product should be steadily rising.

Faced with these estimates and projections, most observers have concluded that the cancellation of the fifth Polaris submarine will be only the first of many painful economies. They also believe that the British Government will have to cut down on its military expenditures in Germany. In addition, there will have to be reductions in Aden and the Persian Gulf, so essential to Britain's continued role as a world power, unless these oil-rich areas can be induced to make a greater contribution to their own defense.

What the United States now faces in Western Europe is a friendly but weakened Britain; a strong but critical France, and a powerful but impatient Germany. Already faint echoes of the British dilemma are being heard in German politics. They will rise in volume as the German election next month comes closer. Inevitably, the German leaders will seek a still larger role in the Western alliance.

Nor will they be put off by the argument that Germany already has too much power. West Germany can point to her excellent record in NATO, as compared with France's bleak and negative record, as proof that she has not abused her growing strength. It will be hard to deny an expanded role to West Germany suited to her present position and not to the traditional fears of German motives. Yet such an enlargement of the German position, helped along by a vulnerable Britain, will revive the old charge that Bonn

is seeking a special relationship with Washington.

In these difficult conditions, it is fortunate that Prime Minister Harold Wilson has established more cordial relations with West Germany's political leaders than any British statesman since the end of the war.

The gravity of the national crisis is still hidden from the British people by the deceiving mists of full employment. It will not be too long before the American people in turn have to grapple with the international consequences of the British crisis.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the most brilliant, competent, and, I might add, farsighted—if not clairvoyant—financial commentators of our time is Eliot Janeway.

On August 2 in his regular syndicated column in the Chicago Tribune, Janeway gives a mighty practical reason for supporting Britain's financial strength. He writes in part:

If * * * we let the pound go the way the mark and the franc went in the twenties, we may be sure that the next blow will come from Britain and be aimed at our stock market, which is no longer strong enough to absorb of massive British liquidation of U.S. holdings.

Janeway argues that a relatively little U.S. help today may go a long way in assisting this good friend.

I ask unanimous consent that the Janeway article entitled "United States, Britain: Hang Together or Alone," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES, BRITAIN: HANG TOGETHER OR ALONE

(By Eliot Janeway)

LONDON, August 1.—The obscure, Victorian man of letters who philosophized that politics make strange bedfellows could not possibly have anticipated the impact of Harold Wilson and Lyndon Johnson upon one another. Their working relationship, or lack of it, recalls the parting exchange of compliments between Voltaire and Frederick the Great—"I can't live with you, and I can't live without you."

From the day the present Labor government took over in an atmosphere of currency crisis, it was painfully clear that Wilson's ability to survive depended on Johnson's will to support the British pound and, therefore, Wilson himself. But Wilson has equal power to hurt or to support the dollar, and therefore Johnson. For better or worse, in financial sickness or health, the money markets and the security markets have made it clear to Wilson and Johnson that they must hang together if they're not going to hang separately.

The present generation in Britain as well as in the United States has inherited a distorted idea of what actually happened in 1929. William McChesney Martin, Federal Reserve Board Chairman, in his recent escapade in the headlines merely compounded the confusion. The big surprise of the late 1920's was not the crash that broke the boom, but the very existence of any kind of boom after the catastrophic convulsions of the mark and the franc earlier in the 1920's. In fact, boom at home or no boom at home, the main American export during the mid-1920's, and here is the arresting parallel with the mid-1960's, was financial aid to stricken European currencies. The recovery up to 1929 recorded the temporary success of that currency rescue operation of ours. The crash marked the spot at which it failed.

UNITED STATES, BRITAIN IN DANGER

The rise of Hitler and the fall of France stand as historic warnings of the price a country pays when it suffers leukemia of the currency. Today, it is not France or Germany which is in danger of reciprocal currency crisis, but Britain and the United States, as the feverish gold speculation shows.

If Martin had been a keener student of financial history, he would have warned us more specifically of the real problems of 1929, and reminded us that we failed to accomplish then exactly what we are committed to accomplish now. He would have brought home to us the consequences of that American failure to insure currency stabilization for Europe. Instead, he inveighed against the principle of dollar payments deficits just when a moderate commercial and investment outflow is needed to control Britain's mounting crisis and to avoid its inevitable backlash here.

When the time came for Dwight Eisenhower to brief John Kennedy on Presidential responsibilities, the net of this advice on the CIA's Cuban liberation project was that this was a high-risk exercise; that it was better dropped than carried on irresolutely; and that, once launched, failure would be fatal. This is true today of the 1964-65 commitment to succeed on the transatlantic monetary front we failed in 1929.

HOLDING BACK FIRE

The fact is, however, that we are holding our financial power back from Britain, as she sways on the brink of currency instability, exactly as we held back firepower from our target in Cuba, and in false premises, too. The private sector of the United States international economy has never operated at an unfindable deficit, but because the public sector sent out over \$4 billion of emergency cash last year, most of it to Britain, we have immobilized the international operations of our private as well as our public sector.

It is a rare crisis in which a return to business as usual is all that is needed to calm down an emergency and head off a catastrophe. A few hundreds of millions of dollars of normal business flow into Britain would be as decisive there now as a follow-through against Castro then. If, instead, we let the pound go the way the mark and the franc went in the twenties, we may be sure that the next blow will come from Britain and be aimed at our stock market, which is no longer strong enough to absorb the shock of massive British liquidation of U.S. stockholdings.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for the graciousness with which he received my speech, and the fact that he engaged in colloquy with me yesterday, which I considered to be very helpful in developing the points that I was endeavoring to make.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator, whose major speech on Britain's need for our assistance was most significant.

NEEDED IMPROVEMENTS IN OUR ECONOMIC STATISTICS SUGGESTED BY STATISTICS USERS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in March 1965 as chairman of the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics of the Joint Economic Committee I invited in-

dividuals, organizations, and statistics users to participate in a study of statistical requirements in light of present and future needs of our growing economy. In July 1955 the Joint Economic Committee made generally available a compendium of these views and suggestions as submitted by 74 economists and statisticians in response to these invitations. The compilation entitled "Improved Statistics for Economic Growth" may now be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents.

The views and suggestions were submitted in the form of more or less detailed manuscripts and discursive statements. In order to facilitate analysis and appraisal of these suggestions for improvement, committee staff has stripped them of much of their discursive and argumentative elements and focused upon concise statements of each of the suggestions treated in detail in the compendium. The material has been compiled in this manner solely to facilitate study and evaluation by the subcommittee, the Bureau of the Budget, whose views have been requested, and any other interested parties. Obviously, the merits of specific suggestions, even if made by several respondents, cannot be judged without giving consideration to costs and alternative uses of statistical funds and manpower.

Many of the specific recommendations were cited by more than one of the experts. Increased detail and more prompt reporting were requested most frequently. Particular thought might be given to the recurring requests for first, more small-area data, county-by-county or subdivided regions; second, a central library or clearinghouse to collect and provide all Government and non-Government published statistics. Other often repeated suggestions were to first, reestablish mid-decade survey of housing census data; second, modernize standard industrial classification; third, improve statistics on estimates programs, input-output series, gross national products, job vacancies, employment and unemployment, and credit extension; fourth, supply adequate definitions in statistical data; fifth, expand and improve Federal, State, and local statistics.

Incidentally, this list has been prepared by one of the summer interns on the Joint Economic Committee staff—Miss Judy Record—who is a student at Texarkana College, Texarkana, Tex. I think this is a splendid example illustrating the fine work of which these summer workers from our universities and colleges are capable.

I ask unanimous consent that the summary be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPROVED STATISTICS FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH

- Develop statistical data on extent of contingent or implied commitments (1).
- Compile data consistently within framework of standard industrial classification (2).
- Revise statistics so that average hourly earnings will reflect trend of labor costs (3).
- Extend data on output per man-hour (3).
- Provide occupational statistics showing number and types of job vacancies (3).

- Overhaul and reexamine Federal Government's transport statistics (4).

- Remedy inconsistency in information released by different agencies (4).

- Provide greater amount of small-area data, county by county (5).

- Report annual population and household data by metropolitan areas for more accurate current descriptions of our mobile population (6).

- Overcome difficulty of maintaining adequate flow of data on foreign trade (7).

- Traditional types of foreign trade data now depend too much upon inconvenient tariff classifications (8).

- Coordinate in the Office of Statistical Standards the work of various statistical agencies (8).

- Improve statistics of construction, especially in residential areas (10).

- Release statement of margin of error in economic data releases (11).

- Provide greater consistency in data reporting of series on age, sex, location, total population (11).

- Issue additional data on major geographic areas of the United States, on the physical output and selected container sizes (11).

- Increase standard industrial classification code to cover five-digit industries (instead of three or four) in data as reported in annual survey of manufactures (12).

- Expedite issuance of economic statistics (12).

- Provide separate categories for discount houses and department stores in general merchandise group of the retail trade (13).

- Reconcile figures on personal consumption expenditures and industrial production (13).

- Improve price information on international competitive position of United States (14).

- Improve statistical information on industries of so-called service sector (14).

- Restore reports on economic aspects of the population and labor force to the census of population (14).

- Develop statistics on job vacancies (14).

- Provide regular compilation of information on fringe benefits in statistics of hourly earnings (14).

- Expedite statistics on profits (15).

- Reconcile estimates of gross national product from expenditure side with estimates viewed from income side (15).

- Provide reliable and current information on the volume and terms of credit extension (15).

- Indicate actual prices charged rather than list prices in statistics on wholesale prices (15).

- Support efforts to develop comparable statistics in other nations (20).

- Reestablish the middecade survey of housing in the census data (21).

- Improve accuracy and availability of residential and nonresidential data on vacancy rates (21).

- Provide statistical series on demolition (21).

- Obtain annual sample coverage, rather than complete quinquennial coverage, of approximately 1 million homes for detailed household information (22).

- Incorporate in the current population survey series of questions on plans to marry for single persons and intent to have children for married couples where the wife is less than 45 years of age (22).

- Supply an estimate of the capacity level of gross national products for comparison with level actually achieved (23).

- Provide current summary of credit conditions relating changes in tightness or easiness of credit, mortgage interest rate information, and summary covering terms such as downpayments and loan maturity periods (23).

- Provide separate figures for unliquidated obligations of the entire Federal Government at the end of each quarter for (a)

- Army, (b) Navy, (c) Air Force, (d) all other (24).

- Provide quarterly estimates of Federal fiscal operations on a national income and product account basis running three to six quarters into the future (24).

- Issue, on current annual basis, reconciliations for the following three pairs of items:

1. Personal saving (national income division) and gross savings of the consumer and nonprofit organization sector (flow of funds).

2. Excess of Federal Government receipts over expenditures (national income division) and current surplus of the Federal Government (flow of funds).

3. Excess of State and local government receipts over expenditures and current surplus of the State and local government sector (24).

- Reconsider the standard industrial classification—reform of the census of manufacturers is basic to any effort to improve the overall quality of Federal economic statistics (26).

- Supply specific listings regarding the number of beef cattle farms, livestock operators, number of farms selling grain-fed cattle, number of beef cattle sold per year per farm, expenditures for fertilizers, expenditures for farm chemicals used, and the use of animal health products, by product (27).

- Expedite statistics which measure growth or lack of it in cities and metropolitan areas (28).

- Expand and revise wholesale price index of the chemical and allied products industry to cover a broader sample of commodities actually moving in the industry (30).

- Present Federal budget and statement on the Nation's balance-of-payments problem in a more meaningful way to show the magnitude and variety of activities being described (30).

- Develop a sampling plan to provide useful estimates of corporate profits in a period in less than 3 months after close of period (31).

- Supply further regional data and Federal Reserve Board indexes of industrial production by major industry, and by region (33).

- Provide practical methods for attaching estimates of sampling errors to fluctuations in the Consumer Price Index (34).

- Correct small errors in income or expenditures which could produce errors in estimate of saving in the national income estimates (35).

- Meet the need of comprehensive data on the demand for labor by detailed occupational breakdowns by local areas (35).

- Supply more comprehensive data by States and local areas (36).

- Provide more complete and comprehensive data on consumer expenditures, savings, and income (36).

- Provide multipurpose, long-term data-collection program designed to obtain a comprehensive and continuing picture of the activity of different sectors of the economy (36).

- Coordinate and expand present survey programs for obtaining estimates of consumer expenditures and savings (37).

- Coordinate transportation statistics—passenger travel and commodity shipments (38).

- Develop demographic information on geographic basis more frequently than once every decade (39).

- Regard each central city of the standard metropolitan statistical areas (SMSA) as the center of a functional economic area (FEA) which includes the SMSA itself and any additional area within a commuting radius of 60 minutes from the central city (40).

- Increase available data on individuals' or household savings and consumption statistics, e.g., who saves, how much, in what form (44).

- Supply current information on intercity differences in the cost of living (47).

Provide variety of budgets to measure living costs of families of different size and age composition (47).

Expand sample of households in current population survey so that statistics for States and selected metropolitan areas can be derived (47).

Distribute statistics of expenditures for new plant and equipment with national total by States for regional economic analysis (47).

Provide State and area occupational statistics and data on consumer credit now available only for the Nation as a whole (48).

Publish a compendium of opportunities for special analyses which can be obtained at a modest cost (49).

Supply list of available published information to insure more complete use of data being generated (49).

Take steps to insure that people understand the limitations of Federal statistics and the extent of the threat of misinterpretation (49).

Coordinate State and Federal Government statistical programs compiling data on the basis of economic areas to meet anticipated statistical requirements (51).

Improve and increase building industry statistics (53).

Improve accounts for nonincorporated nonfarm enterprises (54).

Treat expenditures on consumer durables and on Government structures and equipment as capital rather than current outlays (54).

Experiment with measures of investment in the labor force (54).

Improve and increase detail of input-output study by the Office of Business Economics (55).

Offer census tapes to business users for special runs (55).

Publish economic data for industrial groupings other than so-called standard industries; e.g., aerospace and electronics fields (57).

Adopt a more flexible classification system in the standard industrial classifications (57).

Examine reliability of housing starts data and its information on permits (57).

Study price indexes used in deflating gross national product—particularly deflators for capital goods (57).

Reexamine concept of profits—under new tax law, it is difficult to compare profit statistics for two different time periods (57).

Provide for comparability and consistency in collecting local and regional data (58).

Lessen timelag of 16 months that it now takes to attain figures on births (59).

Develop a serious, extensive, and continuing program that would develop and use measures of value for current and proposed statistics programs (60).

Expedite and improve data on population and economic changes through estimates made by Federal, State, and local agencies and based partly on projections of information from the censuses and partly on current data related to the characteristics of interest (61).

Provide periodic checks on the level of current estimates and projections by either a mid-decade population census or additional area surveys using probable samples (62).

Provide for a permanent expansion of the Census Bureau staff and budget to improve the quality of the census small-area data (62).

Carrying on continuing evaluation and research programs extending to questions such as the adequacy of data for analytical uses and the validity of measurement concepts, and procedures (63).

Review respective roles of Bureau of Census and Department of Agriculture in the production of agricultural statistics and

possibilities of achieving a more coordinated approach (67).

Per capita income estimates of farm population are difficult to determine because non-resident operators are not considered a part of the farm population and their income is excluded from the estimate of the personal income of the farm population (67).

Prepare separate per capita income estimates for operator families on commercial farms, noncommercial farms, and farmworkers (67).

Estimate per hour earnings so that they will give an adequate indication of how farm operators are doing in comparison with factory workers (68).

Maintain single criteria in defining "farm" for census—present dual criteria defines "farm" as place with (1) gross annual farm product sales of \$250 or more, or (2) 10 acres and gross annual farm product sales of \$50 or more (68).

Improve classification of farms in terms of "commercial" and "noncommercial" (68).

Provide for greater use of sampling to reduce number of questions of individual farmer and cost of taking the census (69).

Maintain, for usefulness and consistency, a central clearing area for all statistics published by various Government agencies (70).

Use one base period for all indexes to provide for less confusing data (70).

Develop further job-vacancy data for guiding public and private training and retraining programs (71).

Improve quality and quantity of data on construction activity (71).

Coordinate the three major resources of national accounting and financial data: the Department of Commerce, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the Federal Reserve Board (76).

Develop systematic procedures in which the sources used by the Commerce Department and the Securities and Exchange Commission may be taken into account simultaneously (76).

Form unified system of macroeconomic statistics to increase usefulness keeping in mind the international systems (76).

Supply data on small areas, counties and cities, especially for years between decennial population censuses (78).

Tabulate residents by county since all taxpayers must give home address in filing Federal income tax (78).

Review sources of data and assemble into one library (78).

Provide small area information in metropolitan area where numerous counties and States (New York) form one metropolitan area (78).

Expand survey research on travel, vacation, recreation, the purchase of hobby and sports equipment, as well as on cultural activities (82).

Decrease time and money spent on publishing data on foreign countries, on industries with little or no impact on the economy, and detailed cycle data (84).

Continue Labor Department's program on collective bargaining clauses and fringe benefit studies (84).

Issue indexes of prices of imports and of exports (85).

Index of prices paid by farmers for cost-of-living items has probably outlived its usefulness and could be supplanted by regional consumer price indexes (85).

Parity index based on 1910-14 is anachronistic (85).

Extend review of statistics presenting estimates of what the economy will be like in 1985 and then, present papers discussing policy problems and administrative needs to meet future needs (86).

Establish a central office of Federal statistics to aid in supplying available and necessary data (87).

Replace mid-decade census with sample surveys to provide vital household geographic

and metropolitan area detail on an annual trend basis (88).

Increase use of sample surveys to meet diverse needs of society and industry in the changing times (88).

Provide more and better data on county and metropolitan area basis (89).

Establish a population census every 5 years rather than the present 10-year span (89).

Expedite improvement of the Federal statistics (90).

Change the Federal statistics from an ever-growing, loosely structured heap of facts and figures to a unified statistical system (90).

Social accounts, foreign trade statistics, financial and banking statistics, employment statistics as "blobs" do not now make a systematic whole (90).

Modernize Federal, State, and local statistics to form fully integrated, comprehensive, detailed, up-to-date data (91).

Reorganize the Federal statistical system (91).

Broaden and improve data on who are the poor in our society (92).

Define "poor" adequately and scientifically (92).

Provide detailed data on small geographic units including population information on county-by-county and data on education, age, sex, color, occupation, and income (93).

Supply data on the ownership of radio and television sets (93).

Expedite and increase data on specific industries such as chemicals and allied products (95).

Correct inconsistencies and inaccuracies in Government statistics resulting from inadequate or improper definition of the industry or product (95).

Reorganize the collection of economic data to prevent duplication among the same 10 agencies collecting economic data (96).

Publish better and more reliable employment and unemployment statistics (97).

Cooperate in the implementation of international standards to achieve a high degree of international comparability (97).

Establish reliable input-output tables for the United States (97).

Provide general statements on the accuracy of the statistics presented by the U.S. Government agencies (98).

Publish reports covering sales of selected merchandise lines through major retail outlets (99).

Revise standard industrial classification codes (99).

Increase the data of the annual survey of manufacturers to cover a six- or seven-digit standard industrial classification (100).

Need quinquennial census whatever annual sampling programs may be (101).

Provide increased data on marriage and divorce and family function to throw light on social pathology of the times (101).

Create adequately financed, national data library-computation center to prevent tragic destruction of irreplaceable data (102).

Highly aggregative time series do not contain enough observation to permit extensive testing and estimation (105).

Study possibilities of systematic development of time-series data for parallel and approximately matched groups of behavioral components (106).

Establish a national data library of the U.S. Government (107).

Provide statistics on new residential housing construction activity in breakdown of one- and two-family and multifamily housing starts by geographical regions other than Northeast, North Central, West, and South (108).

Publish estimates (Department of Commerce) of housing starts broken down statistically as (a) types of housing, (b) types of structure, (c) types of materials used, (d) geographic distribution (109).

Publish more meaningful and usable building construction statistics and consider the variations between permit data and housing-start data (109).

Redefine (e.g., the textile industry) so as to represent a complete coverage of input-output relationship within a specific industry (114).

Attempt to quantify the degree of innovation in various industries (114).

Provide statistical measurements of consumer purchases of the specific output of a given industry (114).

Consider the weakness of the Federal statistical programs in the construction industry when compared to other industries (117).

Develop data on input-output industry structure as an aid to evaluating impact of changes in the construction industry (117).

Expand Federal statistics programs to provide State or major metropolitan area series on (a) labor force, employment, unemployment; (b) consumer credit outstanding; and (c) capital investment (118).

Adopt a more specific definition of unemployment that is acceptable to statistician, management, labor, and "man on the street" (119).

Consider problem of overaccumulation of inventories and increase reliability of inventory figures (119).

Provide consistent estimates of the percentage of manufacturing capacity being used in current production (119).

Devise an export price series that will indicate actual competitive conditions in international trade (119).

Classify data by zip code areas as a fundamental classification (121).

Utilize large computer storage capacity available for data storage to reduce cost and improve value of data (122).

Determine, through sample study, the cost of data collection and reporting compared with the value of receiving published data from the Government (123).

Formulate Federal information reservoir containing basic public data (123).

Establish business and economic information computer centers to collect data to central Federal headquarters (123).

Update John L. Andriot's "Guide to U.S. Government Statistics, 1961" (124).

Improve timeliness in attaining Federal statistics (125).

Increase compatibility of coding systems and procedures (125).

Supply increased detail in census reports (125).

Consider a centralized statistical reference bureau (125).

Provide data for States and metropolitan areas on the origin and destination of all exports and imports, by commodity (126).

Publish current listing of withholding tax payments as a measure of income, by county on annual or monthly basis, for large counties or metropolitan areas (126).

Supply report of statistics of sole proprietorships by industry in each State (126).

Attempt to meet publication deadlines and schedules in supplying economic censuses (127).

Publish annual person-income series for each of the major metropolitan areas in the United States (127).

Include number of apartment buildings as well as the number of units in areas covered in census of housing (127).

Couple job opening data with data for recent new hires for a better picture of the current opportunities in the labor market (127).

Establish Federal system for standardizing and distributing State totals for construction statistics and payrolls in manufacturing industries (128).

Provide statistics on wage and salary rates by types of jobs (128).

Supply detail and prompt collections of expenditure data on State and local governments (128).

Need more and better information on job vacancies (130).

Provide better profiles of unemployed and underemployed along with system of matching jobseekers and jobs (130).

Establish a more comprehensive consumer price index (130).

Obtain data on actual prices paid by the buyer, not the price supplied by sellers (130).

Develop more adequate price indexes in the construction field (130).

Provide more and better price deflators for use in establishing trends in real output (130).

Provide statistics showing the relationship of education to income and productivity (131).

Improve data for predicting occupational trends (132).

Provide timely, accurate, and understandable small area data (132).

To increase usefulness of census data to metropolitan policymakers, code the data geographically, put it on tape accompanied by standard programs for extracting or combining a variety of information (132).

Provide greater comparability of trade statistics of our domestic production to establish comparison of relative importance of foreign trade for different parts of the economy (133).

Improve statistics on foreign transactions (133).

Provide adequate funds and leadership at the Bureau of the Budget to enable it to review existing programs to detect obsolescence and foresee new needed programs (133).

Provide central agency within Federal Government to aid individual researchers and small research organizations in attaining data (133).

Link together vast data collections of the Government with electronic data storage and retrieval systems (133).

Provide single compendium, catalog, directory, or encyclopedia of statistical material available from Government agencies (134).

Create statistical program for agriculture based upon the facts of today's word—not upon conditions which no longer exist (134).

Broaden studies to encourage family farm, if this is to be a national policy (134).

Continue support and consideration of an annual sample survey of agriculture (134).

Coordinate classification of statistics for "an industry" as compiled by various Government agencies (136).

Coordinate classification and coding of products and commodities for the different census programs among various Government agencies (136).

Supply standard definitions, classifications, and coding among Federal agencies to provide consistent composite information (136).

Provide statistics that are essential to the good management of our economy and our society and prevent reappearance of obscurantism and antiintellectualism that almost wrecked our system of economic intelligence in the early 1950's (139).

Recognize large areas of "unknowns" in changing field of agriculture (140).

Determine whether securing data on technical products and services to farmers belongs to the Department of Agriculture or the Department of Commerce (140).

Present gross national product on regional as well as total U.S. basis (141).

Provide detailed breakdowns of (1) change in business inventories and (2) net exports of goods and services (141).

Increase the frequency of publication of detailed breakdown of personal consumption expenditures (141).

Strive for a quicker release of statistics on gross national product (141).

Consider a more frequent population and income forecast by States and counties (141).

Provide detailed data regarding number of families with children of a specific age (141).

Supply data on the number of grocery stores in counties with less than 500 establishments (141).

CORRECTION OF CERTAIN ERRORS IN THE TARIFF SCHEDULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7969) to correct certain errors in the tariff schedules of the United States.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], I call up my amendment No. 385.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). The amendment of the Senator from Connecticut will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 385) offered by Mr. RIBICOFF is as follows:

On page 35, delete lines 11 through 16 and substitute the following therefor:

"(a) AMERICAN SELLING PRICE.—Headnote 3(b) for schedule 7, part 1, subpart A (p. 332) is amended by striking out 'in item 700.50, if the rubber portion thereof is wholly, or over 50 percent by weight, of natural rubber, and'.

"(b) PROTECTIVE FOOTWEAR.—Schedule 7, part 1, subpart A is amended by striking out item 700.50 (p. 332) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

	Hunting boots, galoshes, rainwear, and other footwear designed to be worn over, or in lieu of, other footwear as a protection against water, oil, grease, or chemicals or cold or inclement weather, all the foregoing having soles and uppers of which over 90 percent of the exterior surface area is rubber or plastics (except footwear with uppers of non-molded construction formed by sewing the parts thereof together and having exposed on the outer surface a substantial portion of functional stitching):		
700.51	Polyvinyl chloride footwear, not supported and not lined.	12.5% ad val.	25% ad val.
700.52	Rubber foot- upper of which does not extend above the ankle, designed for use without closures, whether or not supported or lined.	25% ad val.	50% ad val.
700.53	Other.	60% ad val.	125% ad val.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SURVIVORS OF A MEMBER OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO DIES WHILE ON ACTIVE DUTY TO BE PAID FOR HIS UNUSED ACCRUED LEAVE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 567.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7843) to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to authorize the survivors of a member of the Armed Forces who dies while on active duty to be paid for his unused accrued leave.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 584), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill would authorize payment to survivors of deceased members of the uniformed services for the unused leave credited to the deceased on the date of his death.

EXPLANATION

Under existing law members of the uniformed services who are retired or discharged may be paid for unused leave credited to them at the time of their separation. If payment to the retiree has not been made at the time of his death, such payment may be made to surviving heirs. Survivors of civil service employees are also entitled to payment for accumulated leave at the time of the death of the employee.

In contrast, payments for unused accumulated leave do not survive members of the Armed Forces who die during active service. This is an unjustifiable inequity and this bill would provide authority for survivors of a member of the uniformed services who dies while on active duty to be paid for his unused accrued leave. The bill applies to all of the uniformed services, including the Public Health Service. The maximum payment is for 60 days leave. This maximum is consistent with existing law applicable to payments for unused accrued leave to members upon discharge or retirement.

TRANSPORTATION OF REMAINS OF DECEASED DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 569, H.R. 3037.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 3037) to amend section 1485 of title 10,

United States Code, relating to the transportation of remains of deceased dependents of members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 586), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill would authorize the transportation at Government expense of the remains of a dependent of a member of the armed services on active duty if the dependent dies at or while traveling to or from the member's place of active duty.

EXPLANATION

Under section 1485 of title 10, United States Code, the Government bears the expense of transporting the remains of a dependent of a member of the Armed Forces on active duty at a place outside the United States, if the dependent dies at or while traveling to or from the member's place of active duty.

Before the admission of Alaska and Hawaii as States, the Government provided transportation for the remains of deceased dependents from these relatively remote locations, from which the cost of transporting remains was relatively expensive. In earlier Congresses the Department of Defense recommended legislation to continue the authority for transporting remains of dependents who died in Alaska or Hawaii. The committee expressed the view that after the admission of these former territories as States, members of the Armed Forces stationed in other States should be on the same footing for entitlement to transportation for remains of deceased dependents. Thereafter, the Department of Defense reconsidered its recommendation and under the terms of this bill, the Government would be authorized to transport the remains of deceased dependents not only from the States of Alaska and Hawaii but also from each of the other 48 States to the home of the decedent or to such other place as the Secretary determines to be the appropriate place of interment. Under this bill the military departments would be authorized to pay the common carrier costs for the transportation of the remains of deceased dependents. All other services related to the preparation of the remains of the deceased would continue to be the financial responsibility of the sponsor as is now the practice. Members of the Armed Forces are currently entitled to the transportation of their dependents on a change of permanent duty station, retirement, or in case of death of the member. The bill would authorize essentially the same transportation for a dead dependent that would be authorized if the dependent were living.

DISPOSITION OF LOST, ABANDONED, OR UNCLAIMED PERSONAL PROPERTY UNDER CERTAIN CONDITIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 570, H.R. 5034.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5034) to amend section 2575(a) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the disposition of lost, abandoned, or unclaimed personal property under certain conditions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 587), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill would facilitate the disposal of lost, abandoned, or unclaimed personal property under the custody of the Department of Defense or the Department of the Treasury.

EXPLANATION

Under existing law, lost, abandoned, or unclaimed personal property under the control of the Department of Defense or the Department of the Treasury may be disposed of 1 year from the date the property is received when the owner, his heirs, or next of kin cannot be determined after diligent effort. If the owner is "determined" but not "found," the property may not be disposed of until after 120 days following the date of notice of intended disposition has been sent by registered mail to the owner at his last known address. There is doubt under current law whether this 120-day notice is without regard to the 1-year waiting period that applies when the owner cannot be determined.

To reduce storage costs and administrative work, this bill proposes to reduce the 1-year waiting period to 3 months. Moreover, property with a fair market value of less than \$25 could be disposed of without regard to the 3-month waiting period if a diligent effort to determine the lawful owner is unsuccessful. The bill also would permit the use of certified or registered mail in sending the required notice. Only registered mail can now be used for this purpose.

The kind of property to which this bill applies is chiefly items of personal clothing and personal effects of relatively small value, such as laundry, spectacles, cigarette lighters, and bracelets.

AMENDMENT OF UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICES ACT OF 1951, AS AMENDED

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 573, H.R. 10306.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10306) to amend the Universal Military Training and Services Act of 1951, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by

which H.R. 10306 was just passed be vitiated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the bill will be replaced on the calendar.

INCENTIVE PAY FOR PERFORMANCE OF HAZARDOUS DUTY ON FLIGHT DECK OF AN AIRCRAFT CARRIER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 581, H.R. 3044.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 3044) to authorize payment of incentive pay for the performance of hazardous duty on the flight deck of an aircraft carrier.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 594), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize incentive pay for personnel who perform hazardous duty on the flight decks of aircraft carriers. Enlisted personnel would receive \$55 a month and officers \$110 a month, which is the rate of incentive pay now fixed by law for performance of the nine other kinds of duty designated as hazardous. This pay would be received only for those months during which an individual was actually subjected to the stated hazard. Furthermore, it would not be awarded to personnel already receiving pay for other hazardous duty.

Over 97 percent of those affected by the bill would be enlisted personnel. Out of the total of approximately 9,475 persons who would be eligible for this pay, about 9,225 are enlisted personnel and 250 are officers.

LIMITATIONS ON PERSONS COVERED

The committee emphasizes that the persons who would be authorized the incentive pay would be only a portion of those who serve on the deck of an aircraft carrier. The only persons who would be entitled to the pay would be those who are involved in frequent and regular participation of the flight operations.

EXAMPLES OF DUTY COVERED BY THE BILL

Some of the personnel whose presence is regularly required on the flight decks of a carrier during flight operations include the flight deck catapult and arresting gear crews, plane directors and handlers, phone talkers, elevator operators, crash crew, fueling crew, ordnance crew, hospital corpsmen, squadron maintenance and ordnance personnel and plane captains.

NEED FOR THE BILL

The need for this legislation is twofold: First, it is to provide incentive pay in recognition of the hazard involved in duty aboard the flight decks of aircraft carriers; and second, to provide an incentive which would assist in improving the reenlistment rate of personnel performing this kind of duty and thereby serve to raise the experience level for this essential type of military duty.

A large proportion of flight deck personnel are newly rated third-class aviation boatswain's mates (E-4) or nonrated personnel (E-3 or E-2). Their reenlistment rate is about one-third the overall Navy first-reenlistment rate. The first-term reenlistment rate for these personnel is 8.3 percent. In addition, among the nonrated men who do reenlist many are preparing for duties that will remove them from the flight deck. The inevitable result is an experience level chronically below the optimum desired for maximum safety and efficiency.

Under such conditions, the large number of injuries and accidents attributable to personnel errors stubbornly resists reduction. However, an improvement in retention rate and experience level could be expected to follow enactment of this legislative proposal, and this improvement should further result in a significant reduction of fatalities, injuries, and property damage, and an increase in the combat potential of naval airpower.

DANGERS INVOLVED IN FLIGHT DECK OPERATIONS

Flight deck personnel perform their duties during flight operations around, under, and in close proximity to moving aircraft. They are exposed to hazards from jet intake, jet blasts, propeller wash, whirling propellers, flying objects detached from aircraft in faulty landings, aircraft crashes and fires, and accidents caused by breakage or faulty operation of components of the catapult or arresting gear. The hazards are increased by the conditions under which flight deck personnel must perform their duties. They must work at great speed, in winds of at least 30 miles per hour, and frequently in bad weather or in darkness. Their long working hours during a launch and recovery cycle, the heavy pressure generated by the tempo of flight operations, and the high noise level contribute to fatigue, which in turn compounds the hazards.

Compilation of fatality and injury statistics shows that duty on the flight deck of an attack or antisubmarine aircraft carrier during flight operations is one of the most hazardous types of duty in the Navy. As to fatalities, it ranks next after duty involving flying. As to injuries, it ranks first by a wide margin.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar. I thank the Senator from Florida for permitting me to allow the Senate to consider these bills, to which there was no objection.

CORRECTION OF CERTAIN ERRORS IN THE TARIFF SCHEDULES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7969) to correct certain errors in the tariff schedules of the United States.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield time on the amendment or on the bill?

Mr. SMATHERS. On the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, last night we discussed the situation as it affected this amendment, particularly those phases of it which caused the Senator from Connecticut, who is himself a former Cabinet official and a member of this administration, and who would be expected to be most sympathetic to the problems of the executive department, to be sharply critical of the assurances of the executive department to him, which he felt deeply were not honored.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I regret that I did not hear all that the distinguished Senator from New York just said because I was engaged in a conversation.

Mr. JAVITS. I understand. I will start again.

Last night we discussed the question raised by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, which is that the executive department, in his view, did not keep its word to him. Knowing that, in a sense, he was speaking against interest, because he was himself a Cabinet officer and a member of this administration, I feel that the Senate should pay serious attention to that charge. I have since looked into it, and I think the Senator had a right to feel as he did. I might not have felt the same way; I might have disagreed. But I can understand perfectly why the Senator from Connecticut felt as he did. Enough had happened, in my judgment, to give him the feeling that he expressed yesterday.

Also overnight, I have looked into the merits of the situation. I believe, representing a constituency heavily weighted in favor the consumer, that I would have to oppose this amendment most vigorously, and which I believe bear directly upon the fact that there is a real question of protectionism involved in terms of prices to the consumer, quite apart from the merits or demerits of the administration's position as to how this action will affect its negotiations in the so-called Kennedy round, which is, of course, in the special care of Special Representative Herter.

What affects me more than anything else is that I believe, from years of experience, that the Senate is very likely, in debate on this subject—and it is very human and understandable that we cannot ask Senators, even, to be less than human, to go off the merits, the substance, as it were, and, as we lawyers say, the procedure, and to be strongly moved by what I consider to be a legitimate complaint by the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] as to how they have been used.

I also find upon investigation that this is a complicated problem. Let me indicate to the Senate one of the areas of its complexity.

This amendment would abolish American selling price valuation of protective footwear, entered under item 700.50 of the tariff schedules, and would substitute new rates on the usual valuation basis: 12½ percent for vinyl, 25 percent for low rubbers, and 60 percent for boots and galoshes. Of these the important rate is the 60-percent rate, since the boots and galoshes of synthetic rubber are the bulk of the imports under item 700.50.

The debate on the Senate floor late yesterday turned on the misunderstanding with respect to the administration's support for such an amendment. The real matter for consideration, of course, is whether such an amendment is proper.

Discussion of the merits of this proposal inevitably involves complexities much greater than have yet been referred to in the Senate Finance Committee report or in the debate. These complexities are brought out not so much

for the purpose of persuading the Senate to take definitive action, as to show that this is much too complicated a subject to act upon sensibly as a part of H.R. 7969.

It is certainly a good idea to abolish the American selling price valuation and substitute rates based on normal valuation methods that fairly reflect the actual protection accorded. It is good that there is general agreement on this principle.

An actual weighted average f.o.b. rate for waterproof footwear under 700.50 would be very close to 12½ percent, because this is the rate at which synthetic boots have been entering.

The proposal now before us is defective, because, first, it takes for granted that the American selling price rate should be applied to synthetic rubber; second, it would establish a rate well above the present American selling price rate for india rubber footwear; third, it neglects an important area that equally needs attention, the American selling price valuation of rubber-soled footwear with fabric uppers under item 700.60 of the tariff schedules.

First. The Treasury ruling that synthetic boots are not subject to American selling price valuation was a carefully considered decision by high officials of Treasury affirming the position personally approved by the Commissioner of Customs. If it was wrong, it could have been taken to court, but it never has been. The Tariff Commission followed that ruling in preparing the new tariff schedules, again after careful consideration. The views of the American industry were heard and considered by Treasury and by the Tariff Commission. This is no inadvertence that we are dealing with, after so little consideration, but a major and very complicated policy issue.

The question really before us is the justification for extending the india rubber American selling price protection to new products, when the india rubber protection is based on a 1933 proclamation under the obsolete and repudiated equalization of cost of production provision of the Tariff Act; when there has been no finding of injury or threat of injury to the domestic industry by any body; and when that industry is actually enjoying unprecedented sales. Of course, synthetic and natural boots should be dealt with similarly for tariff purposes. We are all agreed about that. But a proper rate might well be closer to 12½ percent than to 60 percent.

Second. To understand fully the objections to the 60-percent rate, it must be understood that in administering American selling price valuation of footwear the appraisers have had a choice among various American-made products, all of which are similar to the imported products. It was the practice for many years to take the highest prices quoted by established American manufacturers, rather than lower prices at which goods were being offered in volume competitively in the marketplace. Importers objected violently to this method of administering American selling price and, finally, early in 1963, the Commissioner

of Customs suspended American selling price valuation of footwear and instituted a review of the actual prices of the domestic products. No results of this review have yet been announced, but it is well known that the Customs Bureau has been expecting to propose new guidelines to appraisers that would instruct them to select articles considerably lower in price than the last-used price list. Accordingly, the 60-percent figure reflects a practice which has not been applied for 2½ years and which almost certainly is way above the practice that will be followed when appraisement on the American selling price is resumed. Obviously, it is also a reason why the fixing of an equivalent rate requires more careful study than has yet been given to it. In particular, it requires an opportunity to hear the views of interested parties, which has not yet been done.

A further complexity that should be understood is that rubber footwear is on the final list of articles not valued under the Customs Simplification Act of 1956. This complicates the Customs Bureau's task of selecting proper American selling price prices and has to be considered in a full review of the subject.

Abolition of American selling price valuation is certainly a desirable end in itself, but does not in the least justify an increase in the tariff protection already being given.

I am glad that there is complete agreement in this body that American selling price should be abolished, but the question to be answered is the justification for continuing—let alone extending—such extraordinary protection for a prosperous and expanding American industry. If such protection had resulted from an escape-clause investigation, it would automatically have been reviewed periodically, but this protection involved no finding of injury or threat of injury and the justification has not been reviewed since its inception 32 years ago. Nor has it become merged into the general tariff schedules, because other footwear is subject to ad valorem rates on f.o.b. values of 10 to 20 percent, and other rubber products, in general, take exactly the same 12½ percent rate derived from paragraph 1537(b), but on the normal valuation basis.

The effect of imports on the domestic industry was not germane to the 1933 proclamation and has not been examined by any competent body. It has been suggested here, and in the Finance Committee report, that that effect on the U.S. industry is serious. It is true that imports of rubber footwear have increased. At the same time, however, the rubber and plastic footwear sales of the domestic industry have increased phenomenally, and so has employment.

The value of shipments for the U.S. rubber footwear industry—SIC 3021—increased steadily year by year from \$50 million in 1938 to \$229 million in 1958 to \$352 million in 1963—Census Bureau. Shipments in 1964 exceeded 1963 in all categories—Department of Commerce, BDSA.

Employment has grown steadily from 18,000 in 1939 to 29,000 in 1963—Census Bureau. BLS reports growth for the

same industry from 24,200 in 1961 to 27,300 in 1963, 27,500 in 1964, and 29,600 for the first 4 months of 1965. If comparison is made with the first 4 months of 1964, an increase is shown of more than 3,000 workers since the same period last year.

We often speak of these tariff questions as if they involved only the interests of American producers and those involved in the import trade. However, they also deeply concern the American public, whose cost of living is vitally affected. I am advised that any significant increase in the present duties on these rubber products will destroy existing price lines. With imports unavailable, the poor, who chiefly buy the imports, would have to pay, on the average, \$2 more for a pair of galoshes now available for \$2.99, for instance, and a much greater increase on rubber boots—particularly the kind used largely by farmers and workers. The situation today is that the need for low-priced items is supplied almost entirely by the imports. We would not find them in the stores we buy in, but go to the poorer neighborhoods, and you will see that the imports often make the difference between having protective footwear against cold and wet, or not having it at all.

These are complicated problems involving the question whether synthetic rubber shall be treated the same as natural rubber. There are strong arguments on both sides of the question, when we take into consideration the obsolescence of the proclamation of 1933 as the essential basis for the application of the formula which is contained in the amendment, and, on the other hand, the practices of the Treasury Department, which have been followed consistently for 2½ years, upon which people have invested considerable sums of money going just the other way, and who, I think, would have come to this conclusion which I should like to express to my colleagues as, in my judgment, being the only way out of the dilemma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may I have 2 additional minutes?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in my judgment—and I submit this as the view of one Senator—under the circumstances, the manager of the bill ought to take the amendment to conference—and that should be a great satisfaction to the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Indiana. What they ought to do at the same time, however, is to assure Senators like myself, who come from the great consumer States, and members of their own committees who had serious doubts about the problem, that they will, in a technical, really professional sense, inventory this question carefully in conference and endeavor to reach a solution which will be fair not only to the producer—which I think this proposal will be—it is more than fair to the producers; it is really a protectionist tariff—but realizing that there is a consumer-competitor factor, not only

on the import question but on the consumer question, as to which the consumer is entitled to have the benefit.

I hope we might have that assurance from the managers of the bill, because, in my judgment, considering the circumstances which we face as a practical situation, we could hash this problem out for hours and come to the same result.

In my opinion, the Senator from Connecticut has a legitimate complaint considering what he was led to believe. But we come to the same result. There would be only an exacerbation of the debate, which would bring us to exactly the same point.

I feel that the consumer interest, if we can get such an assurance from the managers of the bill, would be better protected in the way I have just suggested than in any other way.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

First, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] be added as a cosponsor of the Hartke-Ribicoff amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIRE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am grateful to the Senator from New York for his remarks.

I say to the manager of the bill, taking into account what will transpire in conference, that it should be kept in mind that we are straightening out an analogy that there is no basic difference between natural-rubber and synthetic-rubber boots.

No one can tell the difference.

Keep in mind that between 1959 and 1963, since the Treasury made the ruling, imports have risen from 8 percent of the total consumption of the United States to 37 percent. For the first 6 months of 1965, the dollar value in imports of these items has increased 159 percent.

Specifically, if we hurt a basic industry such as the rubber boot and rubber shoe industry, if we damage the rights of the workers, then we hurt them as consumers. We hurt everyone who depends upon them.

I believe that this proposal is a fair compromise. This would eliminate the American selling price. It would give justice to all parties involved. It would carry out the intention of the Tariff Commission and of the office of Governor Herter.

Under the circumstances, I hope that the Senator in charge of the bill will accept the amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the committee voted on this question on two occasions. With one set of committee members present and another set absent, they voted to give the Senator the protection that he asked for in the first instance. Then, with a different set of Senators present, they voted to rescind the action formerly taken.

The Senator is proposing a kind of split-the-difference proposal.

Mr. Herter's office had suggested this solution. I do not believe that it is fair to say that the State Department betrayed the Senator. The other officials did not know that this was being suggested as a compromise.

I believe that it is a satisfactory amendment, and I am pleased to accept it.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, no Senator has fought more vigorously to protect the American consumer than has the senior Senator from Rhode Island. If I were to characterize the senior Senator from Rhode Island, I would say that he is a consumer's Senator. That is not self-serving. I have proved that on every single occasion in which the problem arose in the 15 years that I have been privileged to be a U.S. Senator. I feel that is my duty.

I have said time and time again, "Please let us not adopt practices here under the pretext that we are protecting the consumer when what we are actually doing is 'killing the goose that laid the golden egg'—America's own industrial security."

There is not an individual in America who does not understand that insofar as rubber footwear is concerned, there is practically no difference between natural and synthetic rubber. However, a difference has been created in the parliamentary process to the extent that today 37 percent of the entire consumer consumption of the United States is in the form of imports. It is 37 percent today. It will be 40 percent tomorrow. It will be perhaps 50 percent next year. When we get to 100 percent, where will the rubber footwear industry of the United States be?

At that point, God forbid, if the lines of communication between the United States and Japan are severed, all of us will be without rubber footwear, and every Senator will have a very serious cold, I am afraid, from getting his feet wet. There will be no American rubber footwear industry.

The important consideration is that we be reasonable. I do not say that we should shut the door absolutely. However, this is becoming a serious problem. We must realize that the United States is the only country in the world that is on a wartime economy in peacetime.

We spend \$50 billion a year to maintain peace in the world. What does that mean? It means that much of our industry and much of our economy are devoted to producing the implements of war. We are, at the same time, striving to bring about peace and disarmament. When that day comes, what will we do with all the unemployed people? We will have lost our rubber footwear industry and our textile industry and many other industries in the United States. Where will the consumers go to find jobs

and earn money so that they can still be American consumers? That is the question that confronts us.

As the Senator has indicated, the imports have risen to 37 percent of total American consumption. That is a danger point. All we are asking is that we treat synthetic rubber in substantially the same way as we treat natural rubber. I realize that this might create some problems for Governor Herter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the fact remains that this is becoming an increasingly serious problem, day by day.

I hope that the Senators in charge of the bill will give this matter the serious emphasis it needs when they take this matter to conference. I hope that we shall not be lulled into a false sense of security in which we would accept the amendment as a matter of form, go to conference, and, after a little talk back and forth, would agree to throw it out.

This is a serious problem. The rubber footwear industry in my State has fallen upon difficult times.

My colleague, the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], will offer another amendment shortly that has to do with braided rugs. I shall have something to say about that later.

I applaud the Senators in charge of the bill for recognizing the problem. The problem was recognized in committee. Then something happened. I do not want to engage in any discussion concerning any deals, arrangements, or agreements that were made. I do not know anything about that. However, I do know that, when the imports reach 37 percent of the American consumption, we should beware. Let us beware and let us make sure that we do not kill the goose that laid the golden egg.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Indiana as much time as he will need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from New York for his alertness in watching out for what he considers to be the best interest of his constituency, the consumers. I also commend him for his understanding of what is involved here.

I believe that, after the Senator considers the matter further, he may be convinced that he is mistaken. I do not believe it is a high-tariff measure at all.

Certain elements are contained in it which are extremely desirable, not only in connection with the Kennedy round—there are over 140 items on the tariff—but also in connection with the overall relations of American business overseas. It would place india rubber and synthetic rubber on the same basis.

The amendment would provide for uniform treatment. I have before me two boots. One was made from synthetic

rubber and the other from regular india rubber. I defy anyone under the sun to tell the difference between the two. These boots will be available for Senators to examine.

The Tariff Commission recognized the problem as recently as June 29, 1962, when it said that this is a matter for legislative action. They had a problem in trying to deal with the American selling price. The American selling price has been eliminated, which is a forward step. We are moving forward in a good way. We are ready to proceed to accept this matter as one which has been properly disposed of.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] may be listed as a cosponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I wish to express my strong and enthusiastic support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] to establish more equitable rates of duty on waterproof footwear. More than 3,000 workers in my State depend on this industry for their livelihood and they have for too long dwelt under the disadvantage of mounting incursions of low-priced foreign products, particularly in the field of synthetics. These peoples badly need our assistance and I therefore strongly support the Ribicoff amendment.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I am willing to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, first I commend the able Senator from New York for the statement which he has made earlier.

The conclusion at which he has arrived is the identical conclusion that I arrived at last night, and which I endeavored to persuade him to accept last night. However, he wanted to take the opportunity to look at it for himself and satisfy himself as to the facts which were involved. We are going into conference to take a look at it. We need to take a technical and professional look at the entire subject once again.

There is no question that the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] and the able Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] have been in some way misled, not intentionally, by the representatives of Mr. Herter, and in some instances the representatives of the State Department. We will look into the situation thoroughly. I am sure we shall be able to come forth with a compromise which is in the best interest of the Nation. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for the repetition of one other factor for the consideration of the conferees, I understand that there

has been no injury or threat of injury found in this case by any organized governmental body, and that the industry is enjoying unprecedented success. I am sure the conferees will take that fact into consideration.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 385.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, and ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the reading of the amendment will be dispensed with, and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment offered by Mr. LONG of Louisiana is as follows:

At the proper place insert the following new section:

"SEC. —. Wood particle board imported into Puerto Rico.

"The headnotes for schedule 2, part 3 (p. 97) are amended by adding at the end thereof the following new headnote:

"3. In the case of wood particle board provided for in item 245.50 entered in Puerto Rico and to be consumed therein, the rate of duty applicable to articles to which column numbered 1 applies shall be whichever of the following is the lower:

"(i) the rate of duty set forth in column numbered 1 of such item; or

"(ii) the rate of duty prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, by regulations, as necessary or desirable for the economic interest of Puerto Rico."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this amendment sets the stage for possible compromise between the House and Senate on wood particle board. The House provided added protection for particle board, but the Senate struck it out. The amendment would permit Surinam particle board to be imported into Puerto Rico. Because it might be subject to a point of order in conference, I am offering the amendment so that there will be greater flexibility in conference.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I shall be glad to take the Senator's amendment to conference.

It would permit a duty of less than 12 percent to be imposed upon particle board imported into Puerto Rico and consumed there. The amendment is quite similar to the treatment of coffee imported into Puerto Rico, in that it would authorize a rate of duty difference from that which applies to imports into the United States generally.

The whole idea is to have the matter in conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all time on the amendment has been yielded back, and the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Florida a question at this point about a provision in the committee bill? The Finance Committee added a new provision, section 17, to restore duty-free treatment to certain bags which had been split along the side and bottom and which when imported are used in wrapping cotton bales. Was it the committee's understanding, in approving section 17, that it provides duty-free treatment for split bags from sugar and other similar bags?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct. Under section 17 it makes no difference what kind of used bag or sack the cotton wrapping may be recovered from so long as it is woven of vegetable fiber. It is the committee's clear understanding that this amendment fully restores the duty-free treatment these split bags enjoyed before the tariff schedules were changed. These split bags generally are stitched together to make pieces large enough to cover a cotton bale.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a technical correction to section 51 of the bill, which would strike out the words "photocell components" and insert more technical words "photoelectric sensing devices."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 32, in the matter following line 16, to strike out "photocell components" and insert "photoelectric sensing devices."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have discussed this with the manager of the bill and he has agreed that this does from a technical standpoint, reflect the description of the device used better than would the committee language.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the Senator is correct, and I am willing to accept this technical correction.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I have one further question, regarding this same section. It will be noted that the phrase "similar agricultural products" is used. Could the Senator advise me if this language would also cover cherries, fruits, and other agricultural products that are grown on trees or produced on plants?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct in his conclusion. It is not the intent of the Senate to limit the classes of agricultural products by this new item in the bill. This new item refers only to a machine which is designed to separate the "good" from the "reject" of agricultural products.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish to thank the Senator from Florida for clarification of this question I had in mind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To which side is the time to be charged?

Without objection, the time will be charged equally.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Finance, I send to the desk a series of clerical and technical amendments and ask that they be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendments.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments offered by Mr. LONG of Louisiana are as follows:

On page 29, line 11, strike out the comma after "(p. 309)".

On page 29, line 16, strike out the comma after "subpart A".

On page 32, after line 11, insert:

"772.50"	Designed for tires provided for in Item 772.50.....	Free	Free
----------	---	------	------

On page 33, line 1, insert a comma after "warehouse" and strike out the comma after "consumption".

On page 35, line 19, strike out "pandan" and insert "pandan".

On page 39, line 2, strike out "HEAT SENSITIVE" and insert "HEAT-SENSITIVE".

On page 47, line 16, after "entered" insert a comma.

On page 47, line 17, after "warehouse" insert a comma.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, these amendments have no substance. Some of them involve mistakes in printing. Others involve misplaced or omitted commas.

I ask that they be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be listed as a cosponsor of the Hartke-Ribicoff-Pastore amendment, which was agreed to earlier.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the bill under consideration, and send it to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. — BRAIDED RUGS MADE OF TUBULAR BRAIDS WITH A CORE

(a) IN GENERAL.—Item 361.05 (p. 150) is amended by striking out "(except tubular braids with a core)".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after a date to be specified by the President in a notice to the Secretary of the Treasury following such negotiations as may be necessary to effect a modification or a termination of any international obligations of the United States with which the amendment might conflict, but in any event not later than the 180th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to himself?

Mr. PELL. I yield myself as much time as may be necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island yields himself such time as may be necessary.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PELL. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, how much time is allotted on the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifteen minutes to each side.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator leave 5 minutes for me?

Mr. PELL. Absolutely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I am compelled by a serious injustice in our tariff schedules to take the floor and offer an amendment to H.R. 7969, the act correcting certain errors in the Tariff Schedules.

On July 22, I introduced S. 2319, a bill to amend the Tariff Schedules with respect to the classification of certain types of braided rugs. The bill was referred to the Senate Finance Committee for its consideration.

At that time, I pointed out that our domestic braided-rug industry, highly concentrated in my home State of Rhode Island, is laboring under what I consider a misinterpretation of our tariff laws. These laws provide that braided materials are dutiable at the rate of 42.5 percent. In 1944 the customs court, in a dispute over the classification of novelty braid used as trim for shoes and ladies' handbags, held that a tubular braided sheath around a filler core was not a true braid. Braids with a filler core consequently can be termed tubular mats and subjected to duty of only 15 to 16.5 percent.

Foreign manufacturers have only recently begun to take advantage of this loophole, but are doing so now and at an alarming rate. In 1964, for example, imports rose to 114 million square feet, a 100-percent increase from the 53 million square feet in 1963. This massive influx of braided rugs through the court-created loophole sharply curtails the market opportunities of our domestic producers, and I seek to plug that loophole.

The Senate Finance Committee did not see fit to incorporate my bill amending the tariff schedules into its version of H.R. 7969, the House bill. I have been given to understand that certain segments of the retail industry presented a well-organized opposition to any change in the tariff classification of these rugs. But to me, a braided rug by any other name is still a braided rug, whether it has a filler core or not. Our tariff laws should reflect this simple fact.

I have here on my desk two rugs, similar in size, shape, and construction. One is made in Pawtucket, R.I., and throughout its life is always termed a braided rug. The other rug is made in Japan. I do not know what it is called when it is made. But, when it arrives at U.S. customs it is a tubular mat, and as such is dutiable at 15 to 16.5 percent. This Japanese rug then undergoes some mystifying transformation, a sort of rechristening, and when advertised and sold it is no longer a tubular mat but a braided rug. I submit that our tariff laws exhibit a large loophole here, and that foreign manufacturers are taking advantage of us by reason of it.

The American-made rug sells for \$7.95, the Japanese for \$4.99. Using the duty rate of 16.5 percent, the Japanese rug was subject to a duty of 30 cents. But, using the proper rate of 42.5 percent, it would have been subject to a \$1.72 duty, bringing its retail price to \$6.41. This does not make it exactly competitive with the American price of \$7.95, but it is at least more competitive than before, and it has the added attraction of restoring some degree of consistency to our tariff laws.

I urge the Senate to recognize the merits of this amendment which plugs a serious loophole in our tariff laws.

Mr. President, although the two rugs before me look exactly alike in every respect, one is made in Rhode Island and the other is made in Japan. The Customs Office does not call the Japanese rug a braided rug. It calls it a tubular mat but it is sold as a braided rug. My plea and that of my senior colleague [Mr. PASTORE], who is also involved in this matter, is that when a product is sold as a braided rug it should pay duty as a braided rug.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I yield to my senior colleague as much time as he desires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for the remaining period of 15 minutes.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, each year, under President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and President Johnson, when I have been asked to vote for the Trade Expansion Act, I have voted for it. I am one of those who believe in international trade. I am all for it. But, when we reach the point where we actually make foreign producers "Philadelphia lawyers," I have "had" it.

I have certainly "had" it in this case. This is one clear case of a subterfuge, a deception, and an abuse of our tariff laws.

Senators can see the example of the two rugs now on the desk of my colleague [Mr. PELL]. They are braided rugs. They are sold on the American market to the American consumer as a braided rug.

The tariff on a completely braided rug at the port of entry is approximately 42½ percent ad valorem.

But what is the gimmick to defeat the American law?

They take a tube and put a braid around it. It looks like a braided rug. It is being sold as a braided rug; but when it reaches the port of entry the customs office has said that now it is a tubular mat, so the tariff comes down from 42½ percent to 15 percent.

Whom do we hurt? We hurt the American worker.

One reason why I feel the way I do is that this particular American worker happens to live in Rhode Island, in great part.

I have lived with this problem for many years. Let me give an example. I hold in my hand a catalog of one of the mail houses. It is a large mail house, the Spiegel Co. On pages 148 and 158 there are pictures of these rugs. They are called "braided nylon rugs." That is how they are advertising to the American public in this catalog.

This same rug, when it came into the United States, came in as a tubular mat. The reason why it came in as a tubular mat is that the tariff would drop from 42½ percent to 15 percent.

Let me tell the Senate how these rugs are advertised in this catalog: It reads:

Add charm—an early American touch—to your home.

An early American touch. Charm. Add a charming American touch to your home. The advertisement goes on to say:

At extra sale low prices. Made to our specifications and imported from Japan for greater savings.

There is the gimmick. Early American, made in Japan. Make your American home a beautiful American home. Japanese style. But, take this carpet that comes in here under a deception, in order to do what? Decorate an American home to destroy American industry.

Mr. President, it behooves the committee, any time a loophole is found, to close it.

That is what happened? The committee was ready to take this amendment because it was persuaded by the presentation which was made.

Then what happened? One of those who represent the importers flooded the committee with telegrams from retailers. And help came to a halt.

I realize that perhaps we should not amend the law on the floor of the Senate, and I do not expect that today; but I am saying to RUSSELL LONG, to GEORGE SMATHERS, to HARRY BYRD, and to every other member of that committee, "You owe it to us. You owe it to my State. You owe it to the American people to hold an investigation and a hearing on this matter to get down to justice, equity, and truth."

That is all we are pleading for today. We are asking the committee to close a

loophole. We are not asking for charity. We speak in the name of our economy. We are doing it in the name of American jobs.

Here is the evidence—exhibit A, the two rugs on the desk of my colleague [Mr. PELL]. One is a braided rug and one is a tubular mat at port of entry, but on the counter in a department store they are both sold as braided rugs.

The whole gimmick is to beat the American worker.

I say that the time has come when we must stand up and insist that equity and justice be served on both sides of the ocean.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I hope very much that Senators will not insist on this amendment at this time.

Of course the Senators from Rhode Island have a case. The committee, in considering regular tariff bills would be glad to study the problem, but the two Senators from Rhode Island seem to proceed under the assumption that the tubular braided rug competes with the real braided rug.

That is really not correct. Although they do look very much alike, there is all the difference in the world between them.

I have here two carpets, showing the difference between a true braided rug and a tubular rug. Senators can see that one is a much more expensive and better product.

The braided rug is braided all the way through, while the tubular rug has a core in the middle and the braid is braided around it.

While they look alike, there is a great difference in quality.

I have here a Sears Roebuck catalog, which advertises both rugs. They sell the American braided rug and they also sell the tubular rug. It will be noticed that the braided run, which is a far better commodity, sells for \$129.95.

On the other side of the page a tubular rug is shown. That sells for \$39.95. Therefore, while they look exactly alike, one sells for more than three times the price of the other, because it is a far superior product.

What the imported tubular rug actually competes with is a tubular product manufacturer in this country. The tubular rug does not compete with the quality product to which the Senators from Rhode Island have referred.

The committee would be willing to study the subject and look at it as a tariff matter at a later time. The bill now before the Senate merely seeks to correct obvious errors in the tariff schedules that occurred when we adopted the law.

We had hoped that these controversial matters, particularly with reference to general level of tariffs, would not be considered. If the amendment were agreed to it would have the effect of raising the tariff on the Japanese product from 15 to 42½ percent. It might be that that is more protection than the American manufacturers would need.

Tubular rugs are made in this country to look like braided rugs.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Why does the Senator think that we got into that market? We were forced to get into it. A braided rug is a braided rug. These people thought of this ingenious idea of putting a tube in it. We are talking about percentages. What difference does it make? After all, we are talking about percentages. Why should one be 15 percent and the other 42½ percent?

This all started as a "gimmick."

First of all we had a braided rug. It was called a braided rug. Its tariff would be 42½ percent. Ingeniously, the tubular rug was designed. It is a braided rug, and it is called a tubular rug. Then we started chasing them. That is why we are making a tubular rug. We always have to hold our hands to our head. This is a loophole, Mr. President, pure and simple. There is more involved here than the price. I am talking about percentages. I am not saying they should pay the same fee at the gate for a tubular rug that they pay for a braided rug. They should pay the same percentage. This product was devised to defeat the American braided rug industry. I say that advisedly. It was done to destroy us. We ought to stop it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We would be willing to look into this matter and study it, along with the problems of several other industries. We have some problems in Louisiana, where industries are suffering from competition. We do not believe that the 42½-percent rate is necessarily the correct rate, although it may be that some additional protection might be available. We would hope not to become involved in a consideration of the entire tariff schedule. If we are to pursue this kind of amendment, I would have to offer an amendment to increase the tariff on oil. We are being hurt, too. We do not want to become involved in those matters. The bill is designed to correct errors.

The Senators might well prejudice the merits of their amendment by insisting on it at this time. I hope they will reserve judgment on it and submit the amendment to the committee.

We will look at the problem and see if we can obtain some recommendation from the Tariff Commission on how much of a tariff might be justified in this case. We would be willing to look into it. I may say to the Senators from Rhode Island that they have already introduced a bill, on which departmental reports have been requested. Perhaps they will help us determine how much protection should be given.

Mr. PASTORE. The committee will go into this question; is that correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Some time during this Congress we hope to go into this question to see how much protection is needed. I assure Senators that the committee will consider it.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his assurance that consideration will be given to it. I hope hearings will be held on it.

I thank also my senior colleague from Rhode Island, who is far more articulate than I, for his support.

I point out, in closing, that one-half of the American braided rug manufacturers are located in my small State and that it is, consequently, of vital concern to many Rhode Islanders.

I accept the suggestion of the Senator in charge of the bill, and I withdraw the amendment at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be not read but printed in the RECORD.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I should like to hear the amendment read.

Mr. PROUTY. I shall explain it.

Mr. GORE. I would like to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. —. SPRING-TYPE CLOTHESPIN.

Schedule 7, part 13, subpart A is amended—

(1) by striking out "20 cents per gross" each place it appears in item 790.05 (p. 397) and inserting in lieu thereof "30 cents per gross"; and

(2) by striking out "18 cents per gross (s)" in item 790.06 (p. 397) and inserting in lieu thereof "28 cents per gross (s)".

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield myself 7 minutes.

This amendment proposes to increase the tariff on spring clothespins entering this country from 20 cents to 30 cents per gross. The amendment is being offered because I have been convinced that this industry, though a small one as industries national in scope are measured, is suffering from import competition—competition which the industry can ill afford, and which this country can ill afford when it means loss of jobs.

The spring clothespin industry is in a curious situation where imports are concerned. On September 10, 1957, in escape clause action, the Tariff Commission determined that spring clothespins were being imported in such increased quantities as to cause serious injury to the domestic industry.

Then, in 1962, we passed the Trade Expansion Act, giving to the administration broader powers to negotiate our present tariff rates in the interests of freer world trade. Section 225(b) of the act of 1962 requires that an article as to which such a Tariff Commission determination has been made must be reserved from negotiation if "the Tariff Commission finds and advises the President that economic conditions in such industry have not substantially improved" since the date of the finding of injury.

On April 22, 1964, the Tariff Commission, after a hearing and investigation, filed a report with the President in which

three of the Commissioners found that economic conditions in the domestic spring clothespin industry had not substantially improved since September 10, 1957, and three found a substantial improvement in such conditions.

Under this three-to-three split of opinion the President is free to authorize, without qualm of conscience, the negotiations of trade liberalization on spring clothespins.

In a floor speech on April 24 of 1964, I pointed out this curious facet of our tariff laws and noted that it would be prudent "in any situation where the Tariff Commission is unable to agree on any industry's ability to withstand further trade relaxations, to give the industry the benefit of the doubt—a presumption of inability to brace the onslaught from new trade liberalizations—particularly where, as here, the industry is an amalgam of small businesses located in areas of substantial unemployment."

Mr. President, to my way of thinking, it is an extremely significant factor that this industry was able to persuade three members of the Tariff Commission that there still was likelihood of substantial injury to the industry.

The next chapter in the story, is that on November 19, 1964, the Federal Register, at page 15590 contained the note that Ambassador Herter had placed spring clothespins on the negotiable list. The President had decided to permit negotiation of a lower tariff on spring clothespins.

Just a month ago, Mr. President, a representative of my office attended a meeting at the Department of Labor with people representing the clothespin industry. That meeting was called to permit the industry to restate its position in an effort to preclude negotiation of the clothespin tariff notwithstanding the President's having included it on the negotiable list.

Since that meeting, I have not been informed of any action by the President, by Ambassador Herter, or, indeed, anyone else which might give assistance to this industry.

It seems to me that there is no real justification for vacating the escape clause action of 1957. It is for that reason that I am offering the present amendment to H.R. 7969.

Mr. President, I do not make this effort just to maintain the status quo. Nor do I do so from a protectionist point of view—just to increase tariffs for home industry.

I voted for the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, and I have not changed my general sentiment with respect to it. But, I was then, and am now, well aware of the "safeguards," however few, possessed by the Congress in the matter of tariffs.

Mr. President, the Tariff Commission has provided me with some figures on spring clothespin tariffs.

This data shows that even with the escape clause action of 1957 in effect, the share of our domestic market enjoyed by foreign manufacturers of spring clothespins in constantly on the increase. In 1963, the foreign producers had 28 percent of the American market. In

1964, during the first 6 months, they had 30 percent of the domestic market, and, for the first 6 months of 1965 foreign manufacturers had 32 percent of the domestic market.

Hence, Mr. President, even if the present tariff for spring clothespins were not lowered, our domestic industry is still losing 2 percent a year of our own market. It seems to me that this fact alone should have left little else for the Tariff Commission to consider in its 1964 investigation.

The principal countries which are competitors of our domestic clothespin industry are Sweden, Denmark, Netherlands and Belgium. However, Hong Kong is not far behind them in exports to the United States, and industry spokesmen have recently advised me that Czechoslovakia has now entered the field with a vengeance.

Mr. President, I do not like the idea of subsidizing a state-owned industry in a Communist nation at the expense of American jobs. That, in my estimation is what we are doing in this instance.

As to my amendment, Mr. President, it provides for an increase in tariff rate from \$0.20 to \$0.30 per gross. In one of its decisions on this matter, the Tariff Commission proposed a quota of 650,000 gross per year. I thought originally of offering an amendment in that form, and I did so last year.

Going into the matter again at this point, Mr. President, and after Ambassador Herter's action of last November, I decided that an increase in tariff is much to be preferred to the establishment of a quota.

The spirit of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 is totally frustrated through the adoption of a quota. Such action says in effect "We will under no circumstances permit you to compete with our domestic industry beyond a certain, arbitrary point."

On the other hand, Mr. President, the increase of a tariff based upon a realistic appraisal of the comparative cost between foreign and domestic production seems to me a more appropriate means by which we can prevent complete destruction of an American business and American jobs.

Mr. President, my amendment would increase from \$0.20 to \$0.30 per gross the tariff on spring clothespins. The industry is still the recipient of some relief under the old escape clause, and even with that assistance, it is not holding its own against foreign competition. And, to make matters worse, during the past year, the administration has decided that its present tariff is negotiable based on a 3-to-3 split decision of the Tariff Commission.

Senators will note that there is an exception in this amendment. That exception, in the present law, and also under my amendment, gives special consideration to Cuba, if we ever resume normal relations with that country. Instead of an increase to \$0.30, the increase where Cuba is concerned would only be \$0.28. That is in keeping with the present rate for Cuba of \$0.18 as compared with a present rate of \$0.20 applicable to all other countries.

If we were not to adopt this amendment substantial harm could come to what remains of this industry. Three members of the Tariff Commission agree. The fact that three disagree with them ought not to be controlling. We face the evenly divided possibility that this difference of opinion may result in the ultimate destruction of a small business operating primarily in areas of substantial unemployment.

The mere possibility of such an occurrence ought to be reason enough to cast a presumption in their favor and offer them what assurances we can that they will not be destroyed.

I offer the amendments in the hope that this small business, this small industry, can be kept alive to maintain employment for a few hundred American workers who for the most part live in small rural communities where other jobs are not available.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. The clothespin business may not be as large as the steel industry, but it is as important to the people who are employed in it. It still provides a great deal of employment for people who might not otherwise find it easy to obtain employment. It is practically all confined to rural communities at the present time. It is an important industry, a very necessary industry, and I do not know any reason why it should be sold out for any purpose whatsoever for any gain to any other industry. Therefore, I support my colleague's amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. I am very grateful to my colleague. He has stated the case for the amendment very effectively. I point out that in 1955, 437 individuals were employed in this industry. In 1963, that number had dropped to 363 individuals. I do not have the figures for the present year, but I expect that they are much lower. This small industry is going out of business unless it is given relief immediately.

Mr. AIKEN. The clothespin is a very important factor in controlling that much publicized disease shown on television known as "diaper rash."

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I am happy to yield, but I should first like to point out that next Monday the Senate will consider the so-called poverty bill, which involves an appropriation of \$1,600 million or \$1,700 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. PROUTY. The poverty bill is designed to put people back to work and to train them for jobs. We are now deliberately putting 300 or 400 people out of work in the clothespin industry by permitting imports to come in and undersell American workers who produce the product.

I am happy now to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from South Dakota is very sympathetic toward the plight of the workers in the clothespin industry who might be dispossessed of their jobs. I am curious to know whether adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont would have any impact on the cost of living in terms of expenses of housewives who must purchase clothespins and use them.

Mr. PROUTY. It would be practically negligible, because the foreign producers are now shipping in so many that the prices are being held down. At the present time I believe, frankly, that the pins are being sold on such a small margin of profit that the average housewife will not notice the difference and will get a better product in the process.

Mr. MUNDT. They will get a better product at the same prices?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The amendment raises an interesting question. It is also quite unique. The clothespin industry has had substantial relief in the adjustment of tariffs. It is unique that in 1962 the tariff was increased 100 percent. That is one of the few instances in which such an increase occurred. The tariff was increased from 10 cents a gross to 20 cents a gross.

What has happened since the tariff was increased 100 percent on clothespins? My distinguished friend from Vermont uses percentages in his illustration. I should like to cite actual statistics.

In 1962, imports were 2,520,000 gross.

After the imposition in 1963 of a 20-cent-per-gross tariff, the number of imports dropped to 1,896,000 gross.

In 1964, it was still lower than 1962. In 1964, there were imported 2,019,000 gross.

Spring clothespins: U.S. production, shipments, imports for consumption, and apparent consumption, 1961-64, January to June 1964, and January to June 1965

Year	Production	Shipments ¹	Imports	Apparent consumption ²	Ratio of imports to consumption
	1,000 gross	1,000 gross	1,000 gross	1,000 gross	Percent
1961	4,322	4,706	2,024	6,730	30
1962	5,150	4,700	2,520	7,220	35
1963	4,918	4,832	1,896	6,728	28
1964	5,087	5,124	2,019	7,143	28
1964, January to June	2,644	2,475	1,068	3,543	30
1965, January to June	2,749	2,457	1,167	3,624	32

¹ Includes export shipments (which are negligible).

² Shipments plus imports.

Source: Production and shipments for 1961-64 and January to June 1965, compiled from industry reports and partially estimated by the U.S. Tariff Commission staff; imports compiled from official statistics of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. PROUTY. I yield myself 3 minutes.

I point out to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Tennessee, that despite the fact that some increase in the tariff

From January to June in 1965, the number was down to 1,068,000 gross for the 6-months' period.

Thus it can be seen that the 100-percent increase in the tariff that was given to the industry in 1962 has been very effective, as it was intended to be.

Now an amendment is proposed to increase the tariff 50 percent further. If adopted, the amendment would mean a 150-percent increase in the tariff on that one item.

Mr. President, it is easy and proper to be sympathetic with import competition for that industry. The same solicitude could be expressed for other industries, most of which are facing a reduction in tariff while in the present instance the tariff has recently been increased 100 percent.

Moreover, the figures show that the clothespin industry is faring well compared with many others in import competition. A great deal is said about competition in many fields from the Far East—for example, Hong Kong. I cite the experience of the clothespin industry with respect to competition from Hong Kong as a result of, at least in part, the increase in tariff.

In 1964, before the 100-percent increase in tariff, the imports from Hong Kong were 295,000 gross. This dropped in 1964 to 121,000 gross.

It seems to the committee that this amendment is particularly unmeritorious when measured alongside the fact that this industry has already had an increase in tariff, while the situation which most other industries face is a reduction in tariff.

This amendment was not submitted to the committee. It was offered on the floor of the Senate. But even a casual study of the statistics indicates that this amendment should not be accepted.

I ask unanimous consent that the table to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

was given, the product has been placed on the negotiable list.

Three members of the Tariff Commission have indicated their feeling that imports are damaging this industry at the present time. That was a 3-3 split decision.

I could not hear all the figures that the Senator quoted, but I invite atten-

tion to the fact that in 1963 the dollar value of imports was \$700,000; for the current year, it is estimated that the dollar value will have increased to \$878,000.

In 1963 the total percentage of the domestic market from imports was 27 percent. In 1964 it was 29 percent. This year it will be at least 32 percent.

So when the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] suggests that this industry is not faced with a real problem, he is in error. All the facts testify to the desperate situation in which this industry finds itself. It involves only a handful of people, but they need jobs, and they will be without jobs unless this industry receives protection.

Mr. GORE. I did not intend to suggest, and I do not believe I actually suggested, that the industry did not face a problem. American business widely faces problems with import competition.

What I tried to say was that since 1962, when a 100-percent increase in tariff was established on clothespins, from 10 cents a gross to 20 cents a gross, the number of clothespins imported has dropped considerably. I was trying to say that this particular industry was unique in that it recently had a 100-percent increase in tariff duty as a protection, while most industries face a different kind of problem, a reduction of tariffs.

Mr. PROUTY. I point out to the Senator that in 1963 the imports from foreign markets amounted to 1,896,000 gross. In 1964, this increased to 2,019,000 gross. This year it will be approximately 2,334,000 gross. I do not see how the Senator can say the imports have dropped. These figures were supplied to me by the Tariff Commission itself.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Is the Senator referring to all clothespins or only to spring clothespins?

Mr. PROUTY. To imports of spring clothespins.

Mr. GORE. Perhaps that explains the difference.

Mr. PROUTY. I am now discussing spring clothespins, not all clothespins. Imports have definitely increased.

Mr. GORE. The information I have was supplied by the U.S. Tariff Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 3 minutes have expired.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield time to me from his allocation?

Mr. GORE. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator.

The information I have has been supplied to me by the U.S. Tariff Commission. The table has been placed in the RECORD. If the Senator from Vermont has different figures, we can resolve the question in 3 minutes if he will put his information in the RECORD. Those who read the RECORD, as I shall, will be able to resolve the difference.

Mr. PROUTY. I shall do so, because I obtained these figures from the Tariff Commission.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the import figures on spring clothespins for 1963, 1964 and the 1965

estimates which were telephoned to me by the Tariff Commission be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Total spring clothespin imports for 1963, 1964, and first half of 1965

Amount imported:	Dollar value
1,896,000 gross (1963)-----	\$700,000
2,019,000 gross (1964)-----	789,000
2,334,000 gross (1965 estimated)-----	878,000

Imports as percent of domestic market

	Percent of market to imports
Total domestic market:	
4,832,000 gross (1963)-----	27
5,124,000 gross (1964)-----	29
2,457,000 gross (January-June 1965 estimated)-----	32

Source: Data from Mr. Kennedy of the Tariff Commission.

The six principal exporters to the United States: Sweden, Denmark, The Netherlands, Belgium, Hong Kong, and Czechoslovakia.

Mr. PROUTY. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. GORE. I yield back my remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [putting the question].

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I request a division.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if there is to be a quorum call, I shall ask for a record vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on this amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. A division was requested.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Louisiana has been acquiring recruits from the hallways until he now has a majority.

If the question is settled on a division, would it not be better to have the yeas and nays? It would be even better to take the amendment to conference. Let it be taken to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I withdraw my objection to a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division is called for.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask whether the amendment was rejected by virtue of a tie vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the amendment was rejected.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, we do not want a third reading at this time. I understand that there is another amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we have another amendment to the bill. We do not want the third reading now.

I understand that the Senator in charge of the bill has a statement to make relating to a certain type of television tube.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes on the bill to the senior Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator in charge of the bill has a statement to make in response to my query about certain special projection-type television tubes. That statement would clarify the record as to the import questions relating to that subject.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senator refers to an electronic tube with relation to which he does not want the tariff to be increased.

We examined this problem in committee. The article involved is an electronic tube which projects a picture onto a screen which may be 20 feet across or more. Obviously, this type of tube is not a television picture tube in the sense that we know it. It has a projecting feature that the ordinary television tube lacks.

The committee was not willing to make an amendment to reduce the duty on this article without knowing exactly what its effect would be. If the article is not a television picture tube then the rate of duty would not be affected by the provision in the bill. If it is a television picture tube then presumably the duty has always been 30 percent and there is no reason to make a rate change in this bill at this time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator give me time under the bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes under the bill to the senior Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, dawn is about to break over a problem which has exacerbated, and, as a result, has bothered my colleagues this year, as it did last year. The contending forces with respect to an amendment written into the bill, are inching toward agreement. However, I regret to say that the mechanical processes by which the agreement will be finally reached have not yet been concluded.

I shall, therefore, suggest the absence of a quorum so that we can have a bit more time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I hope that the Senate will indulge us temporarily. This seems to be family day, a day on which affairs are settled internally. I hope that we can settle this problem.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes time under the bill to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, my able and distinguished colleague from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], yesterday expressed his concern in this Chamber about section 33 of this bill which deals with unwrought aluminum. I, too, am greatly concerned by the seemingly innocuous language of this section as well as its explanation found on page 14 of the Finance Committee's report on the bill.

Section 33 was added to the bill by the Committee on Finance. Its purpose, as I understand it, is to continue the long-time duty treatment of unwrought aluminum when imported for certain specified uses, but to subject such material to double such duty to 2½ cents per pound if not imported for such specified uses. The committee report in explanation of section 33 states that:

The problem with which this provision of your committee's bill is concerned relates to the tariff status of continuous cast aluminum. It is possible by means of continuous casting processes to cast aluminum in shapes of uniform cross sectional dimension throughout their length which without rolling, drawing, etc., may be put to the same uses as the comparable wrought shapes.

I am informed that there has not been to date any known production or sale in trade and commerce of any aluminum product made by continuous casting which without rolling, drawing, and so forth, may be interchanged in use with the comparable wrought shapes. I have been further advised that the effect of the committee amendment is to impose heavy burdens upon and in some instances to double existing duties on a substantial volume of imports of aluminum raw material to protect against what is alleged to me to be a wholly conjectural, speculative, and perhaps fugitive development in the technology of the future.

It is important to note that the provisions of the present tariff schedules relating to unwrought aluminum have been in effect for almost 2 years. During this period there has not been a single instance of any product produced by continuous casting, or otherwise, which

has been subjected to a different or lower rate of duty than was applied under the prior statute. There would appear to be no need or justification for any change.

A major objection to the committee amendment on aluminum which has been presented to me is the very heavy new burden which would be imposed on importers, fabricators, and users resulting from the proposed imposition of end use tests—not heretofore applied or required on this class of raw material.

It may be very easy for large consumers of aluminum to comply with the import certificates, sworn statements of end-use, and subsequent amendments to previously submitted end-use documents but this is not an easy thing for the many small independent aluminum fabricators in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. It is an extremely high—and unfair—price to pay for using imported crude aluminum.

By and large, these are small enterprises and in fact many are one-man shops who depend on an independent aluminum supply source to stay in business. They prefer not to purchase this vital raw material from the giant American producers who are integrated as to fabrication facilities and who therefore compete on finished products with the independent fabricator for whom I speak.

Enumeration of specific uses for a primary form raw material is difficult if not impossible. The committee amendment here in question, for example, makes no provision for any basic use of the same type or kind as those enumerated which might be developed for commercial use in the future, as, for example, explosive working.

Adoption of use tests such as those here proposed would result automatically in application of General Interpretative Rule 10(e) of the Tariff Schedules of the United States. Under that rule, any tariff classification controlled by the actual use is satisfied only, first, if such use is intended at the time of importation, second, the article is so used, and third, proof thereof is furnished within 3 years after the date the article is entered.

The connected chain of proof necessary to meet these requirements presents a wholly new, costly, and in many instances, impossible burden.

A substantial volume of unwrought aluminum is imported for resale either directly to a fabricator or for warehouse storage and subsequent sale to a fabricator. Although intended use may be known to the importer at the time of importation, actual use cannot be established until the merchandise has been sold and used, perhaps years later. The negative effect of this requirement would be greatly magnified in the case of imports brought in to be placed in warehouse as stock for resale.

Even where intended use is or may be known at the time of importation, the burden is onerous. Imports consist of a very large number of individual entries. Any given entry may be, and frequently is, divided among a number of different customers for application in a variety of uses. Most of the purchasers and users of imported aluminum in the United

States are small independent concerns with substantially everyone in the organization engaged in production functions. Recordkeeping is at a minimum. The supply of primary form material is usually obtained not only from imports but from one or more integrated domestic producers. Stocks are maintained by specification or type, only infrequently by source, and rarely, if ever, by individual shipment. Stock withdrawals for processing are made on the same basis. Certification of actual use of each specific lot of an imported product under these circumstances is commercially impractical, if not impossible.

In summary, any requirement of proof of use would impose a wholly new and unnecessary burden on substantially the entire volume of imports of unwrought aluminum into the United States which would be costly, and in the case of 90 percent of users of unwrought imports, be difficult, if not impossible, to meet.

Mr. President, I would prefer to see section 33 deleted from the bill, but I shall not ask the Senate to do so at this time. But I would hope that the forthcoming House-Senate conference can remove or substantially ease the heavy cost burden which adoption of use tests would impose and which would effectively isolate the many small independent fabricators in the United States from an essential and stabilizing source of raw material.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized for 2 minutes.

WOOD PARTICLEBOARD TARIFF

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the proposed Tariff Technical Amendment Act is designed to correct some of the inequities which have developed in the tariff schedules of the United States. However, I feel the bill is seriously deficient in that it fails to give any relief to the wood particleboard industry. Section 11 of the House version of H.R. 7969 provides a 20-percent ad valorem tariff for particleboard. The Senate Finance Committee deleted it.

It is my strong feeling that the section dealing with wood particleboard should be restored. As this measure now stands, rather than correcting an inequity it would only perpetuate one which developed as a result of an arbitrary action by the Tariff Commission contrary to the will of Congress.

The Tariff Commission was directed by the Customs Simplification Act of 1954 to make an extensive study of our tariff schedules and make recommendations to Congress regarding our entire tariff system. This study resulted in the Tariff Classification Act of 1962, and these tariffs were made effective August 31, 1963, by Presidential Proclamation No. 3548.

In the Tariff Classification Act of 1962, Congress established the tariff on wood particleboard at 20 percent ad valorem. However, between the time the act was approved in 1962 and the time it became effective in 1963, the Tariff Commission in its seventh supplemental report arbi-

trarily lowered the tariff to 12 percent. Under the act of 1962, changes were to be made only if there were some administrative, judicial, or legislative action between the time the act was passed by Congress and the time it became effective by Presidential proclamation. No such action was taken regarding wood particleboard. As a matter of fact, the courts considered the particleboard tariff during this period but their decisions were not definitive, and the Tariff Commission lowered the tariff of its own volition.

Deletion of section 11 of the House version of H.R. 7969 would, in effect, endorse the arbitrary action by the Tariff Commission without justification and would do considerable harm to a young domestic industry.

Mr. President, the particleboard industry in this country is an outstanding example of one which is making maximum utilization of our natural resources. We should not discourage it or hinder its natural growth by assigning a tariff which will invite a flood of foreign competition at this stage of its development.

It is my earnest hope that the House will insist on retaining section 11.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the time to be equally divided between the two sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LANGUAGE TRAINING TO DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE, OR MARINE CORPS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business may be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 566, H.R. 5519.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5519) to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize language training to be given to a dependent of a member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, under certain circumstances.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment on page 2, line 9, after the words "United States", to insert a period, and, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "or while the dependent is accompanying the member outside the United States as a result of the member's assignment to that duty."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 583), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF THE AMENDMENT

As referred to the committee, the bill would have authorized language training for dependents within and outside the United States. The cost estimates were based on the assumption that the training would be given only within the United States. The committee was informed that at a later date when shorter full-time and part-time courses become available for personnel overseas the authority might be used to permit wives in these courses as well. The committee decided to restrict the use of the authority to the United States. This will permit review and a reconsideration of whether the program should be authorized for overseas use when the new courses are developed and when there is an estimate of the cost of giving language training to dependents overseas.

PURPOSE

This bill would authorize language training for dependents of members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps in anticipation of assignment to permanent duty outside the United States for their sponsors.

EXPLANATION

Section 701 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U.S.C. 1041) authorizes the Secretary of State to provide language training to members of the families of officers and employees of the Government in anticipation of their sponsor's assignment abroad or while they are abroad with their sponsor. Language training under this authority must be given in the Foreign Service Institute. Within the United States, facilities of the Foreign Service Institute are located only in Washington, D.C.

The Department of Defense gives language training at various locations in the United States, including the Defense Language Institute, West Coast Branch, Monterey, Calif.; the Defense Language Institute, East Coast Branch, Washington, D.C.; Syracuse University; and Indiana University. The Department of Defense desires authority for the members and their dependents to be provided language training at the same time and at the same place. The Department considers the requirement that dependents may be provided language training only at the Foreign Service Institute as causing greater transportation costs than would be incurred by providing language instruction for dependents at several locations.

The Department of Defense provides language training in the United States before movement overseas for those officers and men whose projected assignments require language proficiency for effective job performance.

The Director of the Defense Language Institute, acting for the Secretary of the Army, has the responsibility for determining how this training can be conducted in the most economical and effective way. The Defense Language Institute programs students into its east coast branch at Washington, D.C., and its west coast branch at Monterey, Calif., to the limit of its capacity and faculty availability. Only those students who must be brought to the Washington area for other special training are programed into the east coast branch. The facilities of the Foreign

Service Institute of the Department of State are also used to a considerable extent on a reimbursable basis.

Initially the Department of Defense plans to use the authority of this bill to train approximately 750 wives in the same language and at the same school as their husbands are to be trained. It is difficult to estimate the precise number to be trained, as the program is a voluntary one.

The bill provides that the training may be given only in (1) a facility of the Department of Defense, (2) a facility of the Foreign Service Institute, or (3) a civilian educational institution. The committee understands, consequently, that the language training to be provided will be directly related to the assignment of the sponsor and that private tutorial instruction will not be provided.

The bill authorizes language training for "dependents" as that word is defined under section 401 of title 37, United States Code. The definition provided there includes spouses, unmarried legitimate children under 21 years of age, children over 21 who are incapable of self-support because of a mental or physical disability and who are in fact dependent on the member for over one-half of their support, and parents who are in fact dependent on the member for over one-half of their support and who actually reside in the member's household. The committee was informed, however, that the initial intention is to restrict the language training to wives.

The committee considers that there are obvious benefits to the United States that flow from an increased language competency by dependents accompanying members of the Armed Forces overseas and that circumstances justify a departure from the general rule of requiring concentration of language instruction for dependents in the Foreign Service Institute at Washington.

TRANSPORTATION AT GOVERNMENT EXPENSE FOR DEPENDENTS ACCOMPANYING MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 568, H.R. 7595.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7595) to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize transportation at Government expense for dependents accompanying members of the uniformed services at their posts of duty outside the United States, who require medical care not locally available.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 585), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill would authorize transportation at Government expense for dependents of members of the uniformed services who are accompanying members at posts of duty outside the United States where required medical care is not available locally.

EXPLANATION

Dependents of members of the uniformed services accompany their sponsors at many stations throughout the world where it is impractical to provide complete medical facilities. Existing law provides no authority for the transportation of dependent patients at Government expense to locations where required medical care is available. This bill would authorize the transportation of dependents at Government expense to the nearest appropriate medical facility where adequate medical care is available. If the dependent is unable to travel unattended the bill also authorizes round trip transportation and travel expenses for necessary attendants. Transportation at Government expense is prohibited if the medical care involved is elective surgery.

The definition of "dependent" for the purpose of this authority is the same as that which applies for entitlement to medical care in facilities of the uniformed services.

The authority this bill would confer for dependents of members of the uniformed services would equalize their entitlement to that of dependents of officers and employees of the Foreign Service.

LAKE MEREDITH, TEX.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 561, House Joint Resolution 95.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 95) to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by Sanford Dam, Canadian River project, Texas, as "Lake Meredith."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I wish to support House Joint Resolution 95. The purpose of this resolution is to designate as "Lake Meredith" the lake formed by the waters to be impounded by Sanford Dam, Canadian River project, Texas. Passage of this resolution would indeed be a final tribute to the tireless efforts of Mr. A. A. Meredith and his work in the support of water resources conservation in the high plains area of the Texas Panhandle, and particularly, of the Canadian River project.

For many years Texas citizens of the high plains area of the Texas Panhandle were aware that the water flows of the Canadian River should be developed to supplement and conserve ground water which is depended upon heavily as a source of municipal and irrigation water supply. These people realized that the future progress of the area was dependent upon development of additional water resources. As the House report points out, largely due to the efforts of Mr. Meredith, the Canadian River Municipal Water Authority was organized in January 1953, and he became its first and continuing secretary. Due to Mr. Meredith's persistence, the many obstacles which faced the project were overcome. For over 2½ years, Mr. Meredith worked almost full time without salary to solve the internal problems of the project. His hard work and dynamic leadership were

climaxed on November 28, 1960, when the Canadian River Municipal Water Authority executed a repayment contract with the Federal Government providing for construction of the project.

Mr. Meredith was awarded many honors in recognition of his outstanding contributions to water conservation. In February 1961, Mr. Meredith was named Citizen of the Year by the Borger Kiwanis Club. On May 4, 1961, at the Save the Soil and Save Texas awards program in Fort Worth, Tex., Mr. Meredith received the top water award for the State of Texas.

Shortly before his death in April 1963, Mr. Meredith was awarded the Department of the Interior Conservation Medal for his work representing a quarter of a century in getting the Canadian River Authority organized, the project authorized, the Canadian River Tristate Compact established, water rights appropriated, agreements on cost allocations and contract negotiations, and an appropriation of funds to start construction.

Mr. President, it is with pleasure that I support House Joint Resolution 95 that confers upon Mr. A. A. Meredith the honor which he so justly deserves.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 578), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

House Joint Resolution 95, which is sponsored by Congressman WALTER E. ROGERS of the 18th Texas Congressional District, would commemorate the outstanding public service and devotion to water resource development of the late Alson Asa Meredith, of Texas, by naming in his honor the reservoir to be formed by the Sanford Dam, Canadian River project, Texas. The reservoir would constitute a lake in the Panhandle Southern Plains area of northwest Texas with a capacity of nearly 2 million acre-feet, covering an area in excess of 20,000 acres. The Canadian River project was authorized by the 81st Congress in 1950 (Public Law 898, 81st Cong.; 64 Stat. 1124) with the support of the late Senator Tom Connolly and then Senator Lyndon Johnson, and is now under construction. It will supply municipal and industrial water for 11 cities and towns, irrigate some 20,000 acres, and provide flood control, recreation, and fish and wildlife enhancement benefits.

BACKGROUND

The Department of the Interior report states that Mr. Meredith was "largely responsible for the successful culmination of the Canadian River development which was first proposed in 1936," and this judgment is substantiated by other evidence presented to the committee. While the Canadian River project was in the planning stage, Mr. Meredith, as city manager of Borger, Tex., and as secretary-treasurer of the Canadian River Water User's Association did much to secure local, State, and congressional support of the project. He was instrumental in drawing up the Canadian River compact and in getting it

approved by the legislatures of the States of Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Texas.

Largely due to the efforts of Mr. Meredith, the Canadian River Municipal Water Authority was organized in January 1953, and he became its first and continuing secretary. He was persistent in keeping the project alive and it was through his leadership and encouragement that the authority was able to bring about agreements among the cities concerned with the project on the allocation of its costs and water supplies.

After establishment of the Canadian River Authority, there was a split in this organization as the result of a proposal for building the project as a private venture. For a period of over 2½ years, Mr. Meredith worked almost full time, without salary, to resolve this internal trouble. His long campaign for the Canadian River project was climaxed on November 28, 1960, when the Canadian River Municipal Water Authority executed a repayment contract with the Federal Government providing for construction of the project.

In February 1960, Mr. Meredith was named "Citizen of the Year" by the Borger Kiwanis Club, and on May 4, 1961, he received the top water award in the State of Texas for his outstanding contribution in the water field. Shortly before his death in April 1963, Mr. Meredith was awarded the Department of the Interior Conservation Medal for his untiring and effective efforts and outstanding service to his State and to the Nation.

COST

Enactment of this legislation will entail no cost to the Federal Government.

COMMEMORATION OF CERTAIN HISTORICAL EVENTS IN THE STATE OF KANSAS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 562, H.R. 7181.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7181) to provide for the commemoration of certain historical events in the State of Kansas, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 579), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of H.R. 7181, a companion measure to S. 224, introduced by Senator CARLSON, is to provide for Federal participation in marking the sites of, and otherwise commemorating, a number of events that preceded or occurred during the Civil War. These sites are located in Bourbon, Cherokee, Linn, and Miami Counties, Kans.

NEED

From the time it was organized as a territory on May 30, 1854, through the Civil War, Kansas was the center of hostile encounters between Free Soilers and the proponents of slavery. These incidents, some of them preliminary to the war, others a part of the war itself, are an important piece of American history. The places at which they occurred deserve to be marked and preserved

so that future generations may have the benefit of visiting them and understanding the significance of what happened at them.

Under the concept embodied in H.R. 7181 this will be done without formally designating these areas as national historic sites and at less cost to the United States than would be the case if they were acquired and fully administered by the National Park Service.

Among the sites which are to be marked under H.R. 7181 are those associated with John Brown, particularly one at Pottawatomie where five proslavery men were killed on May 24, 1856, and another at Osawatomie where 250 proslavery men met and defeated John Brown and 40 of his companions on August 30, 1856; that of the Marais des Cygnes massacre in which, on May 19, 1858, 11 unarmed Free-Soll men were murdered ("the last wholesale slaughter" before the Civil War, this event has been called); that of the Battle of Mine Creek, the last major engagement of the Civil War west of the Mississippi and the one in which Gen. Alfred Pleasanton's forces battled with those of Gen. Sterling Price; and that of Baxter Springs where William Clarke Quantrill, then only 26 years old and declared an outlaw the year before, raided and destroyed property and killed nearly 100 men and boys in October 1865.

The focus of attention for the whole area, however, is Fort Scott which was founded in 1842 in the midst of the Indian country. Surrounding it were Cherokee, Osage, Chickasha, Creek, Seminole, and Miami Indians. The troops stationed there were continuously engaged, from the time of its foundation until after the Civil War, in patrolling this country and in numerous skirmishes with hostile bands of Indians. This fort was also an important center of operations during the border war of 1854-59. The town of Fort Scott was closely divided between proslavery and Free-Soll groups and the fort changed hands between these two opposing forces several times during this period. During the Civil War it was under Federal control, was an important logistic center for military operations throughout the area, and was headquarters for the Army of the Frontier beginning August 24, 1862. At it were organized the first Negro regiment of the Union Army and, in addition, three regiments of Indian volunteers. Troops from it fought at St. Louis, Wilson Creek, Fort Wayne, Camp Hill, Van Buren, Fort Smith, Mine Creek, and numerous other places.

Many of the buildings of Fort Scott are still standing and are in good shape. The parade ground, or most of it, is still open space and will serve admirably for historical and other purposes. Fourteen acres of land, however, need to be acquired in order to round out the picture as it was in the heyday of the fort, to remove nonconforming structures, and to rehabilitate certain buildings which have, in the meantime, been converted to nonconforming uses. A good start has been made on this work by the local people, but the assistance called for by H.R. 7181 will enable work to be done which is beyond their limited capabilities.

COST

H.R. 7181 authorizes the appropriation of not more than \$805,700 for the capital expenses to be incurred under its terms. This amount is made up of approximately \$12,500 for marking the sites referred to above, \$255,000 for the acquisition of about 14 acres of land, and \$538,200 for necessary rehabilitation work. Other expenses to be incurred under the bill—those, for instance, of providing information and services respecting the sites and the events commemorated—will be borne out of regular National Park Service appropriations.

All or most of the sites to be marked are in non-Federal public ownership, and the

bill requires that the owner of any such site shall execute an agreement to maintain the marker in suitable condition and to provide for public access to the site. The 14 acres of land to be acquired at Fort Scott will supplement the 10 acres which are already in public ownership.

DELAWARE VALLEY NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 89, which was reported this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 89) to authorize establishment of the Delaware Valley National Recreation Area, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 2, line 2, after the name "Delaware", to strike out "Valley" and insert "Water Gap"; on page 3, line 14, after the name "Delaware", to strike out "Valley" and insert "Water Gap"; and on page 8, at the beginning of line 2, to strike out "Valley" and insert "Water Gap".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are agreed to.

The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendments to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to authorize establishment of the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, and for other purposes."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

H.R. 89, a companion measure to S. 36, proposes the creation of a new national recreation area on the Delaware River. This area, under the amendment to the bill, will be designated the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area.

BACKGROUND

The proposal to create a Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, formerly referred to as the Tocks Island National Recreation Area, has been active at least since 1962, when Tocks Island Dam was authorized for construction by the Corps of Engineers in the Flood Control Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-874). At that time, plans had not been completed for developing the full potential of the area by acquiring for public recreation use the land surrounding the reservoir to the extent proposed in H.R. 89. The authorization then granted was therefore limited to the acquisition of the land necessary for the reservoir (14,800 acres) plus 9,500 acres on its fringes for limited recreation use.

LOCATION

The Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area will lie in the midst of the Pocono Mountains, near the heart of the most densely populated part of the Nation. It is the combination of these factors, plus the opportunities that Tocks Island Reservoir will offer for recreation, that commends the proposal to create this national recreation area to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Philadelphia, Trenton, Newark, New York City, Wilmington, and the Bethlehem-Easton-Allentown complex are all well within a 100-mile radius of the new area. It is readily accessible to the Pennsylvania Turnpike, to Interstate 80 which connects New York and Chicago, to Interstate 81 which runs from Canada to New Orleans, and to Interstate 84 which leads to western New England. The permanent population living within easy driving distance of the area has been estimated at about 30 million and the projected visitation to the recreation area is 10 million people a year within a few years after the reservoir is in operation and the recreation area is developed. It will be necessary, it is estimated, to plan facilities for as many as 150,000 visitors a day at the peak of the vacation season.

It is obvious from this that the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area will be in a position to serve a large segment of the American population and that it will be of multistate significance. It is, in these respects, very much like such areas as Point Reyes, Calif.; Cape Cod, Mass.; and Fire Island, N.Y. In this case, as in those, the committee stresses the importance of providing national recreation areas near our crowded cities, areas which can serve the constantly expanding needs of these cities' populations by preserving large open spaces near them. It will also, the committee is convinced, be a valuable addition to the system administered by the National Park Service.

LAND ACQUISITION

Nearly all of the land to be acquired under H.R. 89 for the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area is now in private ownership. About 6,200 acres, however, are owned by the State of New Jersey and about 250 acres by the State of Pennsylvania. Although these State lands are included within the boundaries of the recreation area, it is not proposed that they be acquired without the consent of the State concerned. In order to coordinate the program of land acquisition under H.R. 89 for the recreation area with that of land acquisition for the authorized Tocks Island project proper, the bill calls for the acquisition work in connection with the former to be handled by the Corps of Engineers which will, from time to time, turn over the acquired lands to the Secretary of the Interior for administration.

PLAN FOR UTILIZATION

As has already been noted, the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area will center on Tocks Island Dam and Reservoir, which have already been authorized for construction. The lower end of the reservoir

is to the east of Stroudsburg, Pa., and at its head are Milford, Pa., and Port Jervis, N.Y. The dam will rise about 160 feet above the present bed of the Delaware River. It will impound as much as 685,000 acre-feet of water at flood stage, and its reservoir will have a surface area of slightly more than 12,000 acres at the elevation of its normal long-term conservation pool. The shoreline of the 37-mile-long reservoir will exceed 100 miles. For many, the opportunities which this reservoir will afford for swimming, fishing, and boating will be the chief attraction of the national recreation area. Plans for development of the area include taking full advantage of these opportunities.

For some, however, the area will have other and more compelling attractions—camping, picnicking, hiking, and simply enjoying the scenery. It is for this reason that it is proposed to enlarge the already authorized acquisition of lands to include approximately 47,675 additional acres. The lands thus to be included within the boundaries of the national recreation area include examples of superlative scenery—the renowned Delaware Water Gap, 10 miles of the Kittatinny Mountain Ridge, plateau country back of the mountains, 20 or more small natural lakes and ponds, and several scenic gorges marked particularly by their hemlock forests and beautiful waterfalls. With modest developments, these areas can be opened up and made readily available for the use and enjoyment of the public. Visitor centers will need to be installed, campsites laid out, picnicking facilities installed, trails marked, and roads provided for ready access to certain parts of the area. These improvements will be spaced over a number of years and will be undertaken as the visitor load to the area warrants.

The bill provides:

1. The area will be known as the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area rather than as the Tocks Island National Recreation Area. The new name will better serve to identify the location of the recreation area than did the old one and will center attention on its overall importance rather than on one of its least significant features.

2. Language makes clear the authority of the Secretary of the Army to utilize for the acquisition of land for the recreation area the same authority that he has for acquiring land for the Tocks Island Reservoir project. This will avoid any question concerning, for example, his authority to pay the moving expenses of persons displaced by Federal acquisition of their land. This language also provides, however, that if the Secretary of the Army utilizes his authority to acquire land by exchange, the land given in exchange must be in Pennsylvania, New York, or New Jersey.

3. Provision is made for the possible elimination from the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area of as much as 300 acres of land contiguous to Milford, Pa., and as much as 1,000 acres in Sussex County, N.J. Any such elimination will be made by the Secretary of the Interior after consultation with local public officials.

In this matter and at the urging of the committee, officials of the borough of Milford, Pa., and National Park Service personnel met to attempt to resolve some of the differences that had developed as to the location of the 300 acres that were to be excluded from the recreation area boundaries. The understandings and agreements as confirmed in copies of correspondence are endorsed by the committee and made a part of this report. They provide generally:

(a) Most of the 300 acres to be excluded contiguous and adjacent to Milford, Pa., shall be in a southwesterly direction, but an area northeast of Milford can also be excluded if local officials desire and approve such an exclusion.

(b) It was agreed that the acreage contained in the four known cemeteries within

the exterior boundaries of the recreation area shall not be considered a portion of the 300 acres to be excluded.

(c) The Buchanan golf course, located on property owned by the family for over 150 years, can continue to operate substantially as it is now doing. Should the use change then the property would be subject to acquisition by the Department of the Interior.

4. A study is to be made of the feasibility of extending the national recreation area upstream into New York State. The desirability of a study of the Basherskill (or Bashakill, as it is sometimes spelled) Swamp area in this connection was particularly pointed out to and is endorsed by the committee. No extension of the boundaries will be made without further authorization by the Congress.

5. A subsection permits the owners of single-family dwellings, the construction of which began prior to January 21, 1963 (the date on which the first of the 88th Congress bills listed above was introduced), and which is the owner's permanent place of abode at the time of acquisition, to retain the right of use and occupancy for the remainder of his life and the life of his spouse or for a term of not more than 25 years, whichever he may elect, in any case in which it is found that such use and occupancy will not unduly interfere with development of public use facilities or with the operation of the Tocks Island Reservoir project. The purchase price for the land will be adjusted to reflect the value of the retained right.

6. The section of the bill dealing with hunting and fishing makes clear the continued applicability of such Federal laws as the migratory bird laws in the Delaware Valley Recreation Area. Language has also been added to this section to encourage the adoption by the affected States of fish and game regulations of uniform application throughout the recreation area.

COST

The estimated cost of land acquisition under H.R. 89 is \$37,412,000 and the estimated development cost is \$18,200,000. Actual costs may, however, vary from these figures depending upon how rapidly the whole program can be accomplished. Further legislation will be necessary if these figures are to be exceeded. In any event, the costs of the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area will, at least in part, be offset by receipts from the admission and user fees which will be charged under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am delighted that the Senate has just approved the bill to establish the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area. I want especially to take this opportunity to thank the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], chairman of the subcommittee which considered this measure, for his courtesy in expediting its consideration by the Senate. It is most desirable that H.R. 89 be enacted.

The proposed Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, located at the conjunction of Pennsylvania, New York, and New Jersey, is an area of scenic beauty that is readily accessible to millions of residents of the populous Northeast, particularly city dwellers. The primary purpose of the project authorized by this bill is to develop this area for use as a recreation spot by these people. Another purpose is to conserve the area's natural beauty and to develop and conserve its water resources.

Concerning this last point, Mr. President, it is well known that the States comprising the Delaware River Basin—

Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, and Delaware—are suffering from a serious water shortage resulting from 4 successive years of drought conditions. The day before yesterday at the White House, the Governors and Senators from these States met with the President, the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Udall, and other officials to consider this grave problem. Governor Scranton of my Commonwealth offered several constructive proposals to ease the current crisis gripping Philadelphia and New York City, and I joined the other participants in recommending that the Secretary of the Army, the Chief of the Corps of Engineers, and other Federal agencies expedite measures to supply additional badly needed water for these cities. Yesterday, a team of Federal officials headed by the Secretary of the Interior and the Chief of Army Engineers, General Cassidy, embarked on a trip to Philadelphia, Camden, Newark, and New York to meet with the appropriate State and local officials most concerned and conversant with the emergency. I hope that these efforts, assisted, hopefully, by relief in the form of heavy rains, will bring this crisis, to an end.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to join the Senator from Pennsylvania in expressing appreciation to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] and the committee for enabling us to pass the Tocks Island bill. I join the Senator from Pennsylvania in the statement he made with respect to the Water Conference called by the President under Secretary Udall's chairmanship as a critically important element in helping to supply water in the Delaware River basin, on which New York depends for about 50 percent of its water. Indeed, it is said that if the project were completed, we might have no water problem. So it is critically important.

We have every reason to express satisfaction on behalf of the people of the affected States, as I do for the people of New York, for the progress which this legislation has experienced. I express the hope that it will be promptly implemented by appropriations and by vigor in its execution in accordance with the critical necessity and need for water.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the Senate for the passage today of the bill establishing the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area. I thank this body for what it has done for the people of my State, the eastern seaboard, and, indeed, the entire United States. In particular I wish to thank Senator BIBLE for the expeditious way in which his Parks and Recreation Subcommittee handled this legislation.

In a bipartisan effort, the Senators from New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania have been working on this program for a long time. We have been particularly anxious to see this recreation area go forward in conjunction with the Tocks Island Reservoir, which was authorized in 1962 and is now in the planning and survey stages.

This bill will create a major national recreation area within a 2-hour drive of more than 30 million Americans. This

is a sixth of the Nation's population. The area in which this recreation area will be located contains some of the finest scenery in the United States. It will bring pleasure to the millions who use this facility.

I also wish to note with appreciation that the project has been named the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area. It was originally called the Tocks Island National Recreation Area, after the site where the dam will be located on the Delaware River. The new name is much more descriptive. The Delaware Water Gap is the most prominent natural feature of the area, and it is truly spectacular.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I am particularly pleased to see that H.R. 89, which creates a Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, was passed today. The creation of this recreation area fills two urgent needs:

First, the Tocks Island Reservoir will provide highly needed additional water storage capacity for Philadelphia and other cities along the Delaware. If the Tocks Island Reservoir were in existence today, Philadelphia and Camden would not be facing as critical a water problem as they now do. The action taken yesterday by President Johnson in submitting a supplemental appropriation request to expedite construction of the dam means that the Tocks Island Reservoir will be ready earlier than previously anticipated. Development of watersheds along the lines of the Tocks Island Reservoir for the Delaware River must be accomplished rapidly if we are to have sufficient water for our growing population on the east coast.

Second, Senate passage of the Delaware Water Gap Recreation bill will also help meet the recreation needs of the many residents in the New York City-Philadelphia metropolitan area. The millions of people living in cities and towns in this area will have an opportunity to enjoy the parks, boating facilities, and recreation areas that will be constructed around the reservoir. By acting now to create this recreation area, we are insuring that a maximum number of people will have the opportunity to enjoy this natural resource.

I want to express my appreciation for the leadership of Senator CLARK in introducing this bill and working for its passage, and I am particularly glad that I was able to join him as a cosponsor.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I am pleased to note that the Senate has just passed a bill which would authorize establishment of the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, more familiarly known as Tocks Island.

If this most important legislation is enacted into law, as now seems most likely, the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area would be the first of its kind to be created east of the Mississippi River. It would embrace approximately 72,000 acres of New Jersey and Pennsylvania in the vicinity of the famed Delaware Water Gap.

There is a pressing need for additional recreation areas in our region of the country. The northeastern United

States contains one-quarter of the Nation's population, yet it has only 4 percent of the total recreation acreage in the country, excluding Alaska.

My own State of New Jersey is the most urbanized in the Nation with approximately 800 people per square mile. By 1980 it is estimated that the Garden State will have had a 50-percent rise in population. Yet, the amount of our land available for recreation, on a comparative basis, is small.

This project not only will greatly enhance the opportunity for recreation in this crowded region, but also will greatly stimulate the economy of the areas which border on the proposed site. An estimated 7 million people are expected to visit the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area each year.

Part of the acreage would be used to create a 37-mile-long reservoir to be used for water supply, flood control, hydroelectric power and, of course, recreation. In view of the drought which has parched our part of the country for more than 4 years, it is clearly necessary that additional water resources be developed as quickly as possible. The enactment of this legislation will serve that need in a most constructive way.

Finally, I am pleased to point out this bill contains the provisions of an amendment which I cosponsored. This amendment is designed to prevent the displacement of many families who now have homes on the proposed site of the recreation area. The amendment provides that homeowners in the area be given the right to hold their property for life, or for a term of not more than 25 years, whichever they may elect. This provision is similar to the tenure rights contained in the Cape Cod National Seashore Act.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I conclude by saying that the passage of this bill today was made possible by the dedicated efforts of my senior colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY];

they have all worked in a diligent and dedicated manner.

I thank the majority leader for yielding.

CORRECTION OF CERTAIN ERRORS IN THE TARIFF SCHEDULES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7969) to correct certain errors in the tariff schedules of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, for myself and my colleagues [Mr. MURPHY, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. MORSE], the distinguished leader of the minority in the Senate [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the distinguished leader of the majority [Mr. MANSFIELD] I send to the desk an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment offered by Mr. KUCHEL for himself and other Senators is as follows:

On page 43, beginning with line 8, strike out all through the table following line 11 and insert the following:

"SEC. 80. BROOMS MADE OF BROOM CORN

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Schedule 7, part 8, subpart A is amended by striking out items 750.30 and 750.31 (p. 383) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

	Brooms and brushes consisting of vegetable materials bound together but not mounted or set in a block or head, with or without handles:		
	Brooms wholly or in part of broom corn:		
	Whiskbrooms:		
	Valued not over 32¢ each:		
750.26	In any calendar year prior to the entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption of 115,000 dozen (or such modified quantity as may become applicable under headnote 3(a) to this subpart) whiskbrooms classifiable under items 750.26 to 750.28, inclusive	20% ad val.	20% ad val.
750.27	Other	12¢ each.	12¢ each.
750.28	Valued over 32¢ each	32% ad val.	32% ad val.
	Other brooms:		
	Valued not over 96¢ each:		
750.29	In any calendar year prior to the entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption of 205,000 dozen (or such modified quantity as may become applicable under headnote 3(a) to this subpart) brooms classifiable under items 750.29 to 750.31, inclusive	20% ad val.	20% ad val.
750.30	Other	31¢ each.	32¢ each.
750.31	Valued over 96¢ each	32% ad val.	32% ad val.
750.32	Other	25% ad val.	25% ad val.
750.33	If product of Cuba	20% ad val. (s)	

"(b) APPLICATION.—The headnotes for schedule 7, part 8, subpart A (p. 383) are amended by adding at the end thereof the following headnote:

"(3(a) If the President determines that the estimated annual domestic consumption

of whiskbrooms of a kind described in items 750.26 to 750.28, inclusive, or of other brooms of a kind described in items 750.29 to 750.31, inclusive, has substantially changed since 1965 or since the date of the immediately preceding proclamation under this paragraph

(if any), the quantity provided for in item 750.26 or 750.29, as the case may be, shall be modified by the percentage by which the President determines the estimated annual domestic consumption of the relevant brooms has changed in comparison with such estimated consumption in 1965 or at the time of such immediately preceding proclamation (if any). Such modified quantity shall be proclaimed by the President and shall, subject to the provisions of this paragraph, replace the quantity previously applicable under item 750.26 or 750.29.

"(b) If the President determines an allocation among supplying countries of the quantity provided for in item 750.26 or 750.29 to be in the national interest, he may proclaim such allocation."

"(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after January 1, 1966."

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President—

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield himself?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. One minute.

Mr. President, we discussed this matter and debated it at great length last year. We finally agreed to something of a compromise we thought might tend to meet the objections of various contending forces.

This is what I understand the Senator has tried to do; namely, to work out something along the lines of a compromise agreed to last year.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is correct. I wish to go into more detail for the information of the Senate. I am able to tell the Senator now that all parties to the controversy agree to the recommended language now pending in the amendment, and that the State Department opposes it.

Mr. President, I wish to make a short statement—

Mr. JAVITS. This is along the same lines of the agreement?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I speak as an American. I think first of my own country and of the people who make up our society. We are a world leader, with all the concomitant responsibilities. Part of our economic growth rests on trade with foreign countries. I am an American who believes that in expanded foreign trade the national interest is served. I am proud that Canada, our immediate neighbor to the north, is our greatest customer, that the empire of Japan across the Pacific is second, and that the Republic of Mexico to the south is our third greatest customer. In 1963, Mexico purchased \$830 million worth of U.S. goods and services, about \$235 million more than our purchases from Mexico. Last year, our sales to Mexico were over a billion dollars, \$1,076 million to be exact, while Mexico sold \$643 million worth of goods to us. Thus, the United States, last year, had a favorable balance of trade with Mexico of \$433 million, at a time when our balance-of-

payments problem continues to plague and worry us.

I want our relations with Mexico to improve and strengthen. The regrettable, restrictive action of the Senate Finance Committee on importation of brooms would damage those relations.

Roughly 95 to 97 percent of the brooms purchased by the American people are manufactured by Americans. Is that not a pretty overwhelming part of the American broom market to be occupied by our American manufacturers? There has been some conflict raging as to whether provision by law should be made to make it more difficult for any foreign country to occupy any part—however miniscule—of the remaining American broom market.

If we want to sell abroad, we need to buy abroad. If we occupy 97 percent, or 95 percent of our domestic broom market, there is precious little left for our foreign friends to sell. With my vote, I decline to raise a mile-high economic wall around our Nation.

Mr. President, the amendment before us does not do what some of us, such as the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and I would wish to have done; nor, indeed, does it do what my able friend the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] and other Senators would wish to have done. But it will permit a slight participation by Mexico, and some other nations in this American market, and, to that extent, refuses to follow the sterile policy of isolation. In a word, the amendment will set a quota of 320,000 dozen brooms for importation into the United States. This is based on a figure below that of the average importation of brooms for an intermediate past period. It would provide, under that quota to be broken down, assigning 115,000 dozen whisk brooms to the quota, and 205,000 dozen large or floor brooms to the quota, and will provide that they shall enter this country at an ad valorem rate of 20 percent.

On the average, brooms which come into the American market in excess of that number will have attached a tariff duty of 32 cents on each broom valued at 96 cents, or an ad valorem tax of 32 percent.

The bill further provides—this is an important provision—that the President is empowered to consider a growth factor in the American broom market, so that the quota represents not merely an arithmetical number, but also a percentage of the market which may be occupied by manufacturers of brooms other than those manufactured in the United States, and will, by Presidential determination, go up or down as our broom market rises or falls.

Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to be clear that I think in terms of improving relations with our sister republic to the south, where a highly favorable balance of trade exists in our favor of almost half a billion dollars a year, and where, if the regrettable original language of the bill adopted in committee should become the law of the land, the economy of one area in our sister republic would be wiped out and destroyed.

The amendment would eliminate that hazard. It recognizes, however small it may be, the fact that other countries may participate in the market of the United States—whose future, in part, is going to be dependent upon our capability to sell our own American-produced goods abroad.

For every billion dollars of U.S. exports, the Labor Department tells us that 134,000 additional jobs are created. My own State of California exports one and a half billion dollars worth of manufactured products a year, and we send abroad California agricultural products, unmanufactured, at an annual rate of \$327 million. A quarter of a million and more jobs in my State of California are dependent on my State's export trade. How, then, can anyone justify attempting to prevent practically any foreign importation in any part of our own economy? It mocks the intent of the Trade Expansion Act, and defies rudimentary economic logic.

I wish first to pay tribute to my friend, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] who originally prodded the various contending forces in this conflict into agreement. I commend the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] for approving this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am glad now again to observe that all parties to the conflict approve, and that the State Department approves and, having approved, will remain in the position of approving the amendment.

I now yield to my able friend the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, sometimes the basic objectives of our foreign policy are forgotten. We are bombarded with so many appeals for the relief of, no doubt, legitimate grievances that we do not have the time to correlate all the actions we take with the national interest. I suppose this is inevitable. But the amendment to the Tariff Schedules Technical Amendments bill dealing with brooms as reported by the Senate Finance Committee is a glaring example of what I mean.

The Finance Committee's amendment is one which would simply raise the duty on brooms made of broomcorn. Domestic output of brooms amounts to something in the neighborhood of \$38 million per year. It is an industry that has a special human interest, however, for a good many brooms are made in workshops for the blind. Some 750 blind persons are so employed. I can well understand the motives that may have inspired my fellow Senators on the Finance Committee in accepting this amendment.

But what they are doing is bound to have a tremendously bad effect upon our relations with Mexico. Mexico has good reason to fear the effects that the duty-rate increase would have. But, really crucial to Mexico's attitude is the fact

that its broom production is concentrated in one small town, Cadereyta—a town with no alternative to broom production. Passage of the tariff amendments bill with the broom amendment included would turn Cadereyta into an economic disaster area.

Mr. President, we can certainly think of many ways in which to improve the economic situation of people within this country—including the people who make brooms, if necessary. But we cannot change geography. Mexico is our southern neighbor now and for all eternity. It is not in our interests to give a neighbor, whom we want to be friendly, a gratuitous slap in the face.

Adopting the amendment of which I have been speaking would be such a gratuitous action. The American broom industry is not depressed. It is true that imports of brooms have been increasing, but so has domestic consumption. In fact, domestic consumption has been increasing so fast that domestic output has been increasing also—despite the rise in imports, which account for only a small part of the sales on our market. In absolute terms, domestic production increased from \$33 million in 1958 to \$38 million in 1964 while imports were increasing from under one-half million to \$1.1 million.

I do not question, you will note, that this committee's amendment would be of benefit to the commercial broom producers of America. How could it? The result of this amendment would be to quadruple the duty on brooms, making the ad valorem equivalent about 100 percent. I would expect that this high a duty would just about totally exclude imports of brooms.

What I do question, as I stated at the beginning, is the wisdom of aiding this one American industry at the expense of our foreign policy objectives. As I have mentioned, one of these objectives is to keep Mexico a good neighbor. Successive Mexican Ambassadors have assured our Government that passage of a measure to increase the broom duty would have a terrible effect upon Mexican attitudes toward the United States.

Another important objective of American policy is increased world trade. This very definitely includes increased American exports. Mexico is one of the very best foreign markets for our exports. In 1964 U.S. exports to Mexico reached the unprecedented level of over \$1 billion. They exceeded our imports from Mexico by more than \$400 million. While the broom amendment's effects on the American economy as a whole would be insignificant, it would be a wonderful contribution to any campaign in Mexico against imports from the United States.

The United States has been involved in the effort to raise the living standards of less-developed countries since the war. In recent years a great deal of emphasis has been given to this program as it affects our neighbors to the south, in the form of the Alliance for Progress. We have followed a relatively tough-minded policy in recent years. We have not been favorable to tariff preferences for products of underdeveloped countries. We have said, instead, that they stand to benefit from the gen-

eral lowering of our duties. Surely raising the tariff on an item like brooms, largely imported from one less-developed country, makes a mockery of our advice. Instead of seeming tough minded, it seems hypocritical.

Another thing we have urged upon our less wealthy brethren, especially those to our south, is that self-help is an essential element in economic improvement. My information is that self-help is the explanation of the flourishing broom industry of that town of Cadereyta in Mexico. I believe that we have been urging delegations to go there and see what can be done if a locality organizes itself to improve its lot. It would be a terrible blow to our reputation for sincerity if we were now to stunt if not destroy the economy of Cadereyta. We would be saying, "help yourself," but our practice would be read as saying, "but only if you don't succeed too well."

It has been, therefore, a source of gratification to me to have been a party to working out a compromise. The lines of settlement are substantially those adopted last year when I waged a fight on this subject, and it will result in something of a quota and something of an increase in the ad valorem duty. It is not all our way by any means, but it will result in maintaining at least a reasonable status quo in our relations with Mexico, because of the growth factor provision which was added. The basic principle was also preserved which we are seeking to preserve, that there shall be foreign competition, in order that this competition shall moderate the domestic price. Foreign producers, mainly Mexico, would also be able to have the benefit of an increased U.S. market when domestic consumption increases but would have to sacrifice a proportion of that market when U.S. consumption decreases. This is fair to the domestic industry, which involves many broom manufacturers, the blind, penal institutions, college students, and so forth. At the same time the compromise is fair, we believe, to our neighbor Mexico, and to other countries which may be concerned with our export policy.

Let me pay tribute to the Senator from California for his statesmanship and leadership, and also to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] who has yielded, in my judgment, materially, and at the same time has made his fundamental point. We have found a way to get together. I pay tribute to all parties concerned. Personally, we are making progress. The growth factor had a great deal to do with the constructive and creative aspect of the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I join the Senator from New York in his remarks. I believe it has been wise to work this problem out. Not to have done so would have been completely contrary to our major foreign policy.

I, therefore, congratulate all concerned in the compromise which has been reached.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my able friend, the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] and if he needs more, I shall be glad to give it to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, based on the present understanding, I shall support the compromise.

I thank Senators who have previously spoken for their kind words.

I will not speak at length, but I wish to make some legislative history.

Mr. President, brooms are made largely by hand. It is an industry which has not been mechanized, at least in the general sense of that term.

I hold in my hand a list of broom factories or shops which have been closed since 1960. It constitutes approximately six or seven pages in length, double columns. I ask unanimous consent to have this list printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROOM FACTORIES AND/OR SHOPS CLOSED SINCE 1960

Evansville Association for the Blind, Evansville, Ind.
Indiana Agency for the Blind, Indianapolis, Ind.¹
Kentucky Industries for the Blind, Louisville, Ky.
Workshop for the Blind, Pineville, La.
Maryland Workshop for the Blind, Baltimore, Md.¹
Muskegon Federation of the Blind, Muskegon, Mich.
Mississippi Industries for the Blind, Jackson, Miss.¹
Lighthouse for the Blind, St. Louis, Mo.
Industrial Home for the Blind, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Tulsa Association for the Blind, Broomtown Industries, Tulsa, Okla.
Travis County Association for the Blind, Austin, Tex.
Lighthouse for the Blind, Dallas, Tex.
Texas Industries for the Blind, Fort Worth, Tex.
Virginia Commission for the Visually Handicapped, Charlottesville, Va.¹
Oakwood College Broom Factory, Huntsville, Ala.
Jefferson Broom Co., Birmingham, Ala.
E. Higginbotham, Birmingham, Ala.
Warrior Broom & Mop Co., Tuscaloosa, Ala.
Elliott Broom Co., Mesa, Ariz.
United Broom Co., Tucson, Ariz.
Helena Broom & Mop Co., West Helena, Ark.
H. H. Broom Co., Little Rock, Ark.
Halley's Broom Factory, Rector, Ark.
Fort Smith Broom Co., Fort Smith, Ark.
Lay's Broom Works, Little Rock, Ark.
Mansfield Broom Co., Mansfield, Ark.
Pette Miss Broom Co., Whittier, Calif.
B. & L. Broom Co., El Centro, Calif.
A. E. Mize, Castroville, Calif.
Quality Broom Co., Redlands, Calif.
O. W. Haddock, La Sierra, Calif.
Howard G. Carpenter, Pacoima, Calif.
A. D. Blehm, Galt, Calif.
George Hood, Byron, Calif.

¹ Still manufacturing but production drastically curtailed.

C. C. Newton, Strathmore, Calif.
 Little Broom Manufacturing Co., Artesia, Calif.
 Warren Broom Co., Anaheim, Calif.
 Kolercraft Brooms, Whittier, Calif.
 Royal Broom Co., San Diego, Calif.
 Shipman Broom Co., Loma Linda, Calif.
 Castanon Broom Co., Santa Fe Springs, Calif.
 American Broom Manufacturing Co., Los Angeles, Calif.
 Washington Broom Co., San Francisco, Calif.
 Connie Broom Manufacturing Co., Westminster, Calif.
 Lorenz Broom & Mop Co., Arlington, Calif.
 Robb Manufacturing Co., Berkeley, Calif.
 Santa Fe Broom Factory, Whittier, Calif.
 La Habra Broom Co., Whittier, Calif.
 Edward J. Warren, South San Gabriel, Calif.
 Mize Broom Co., Tulare, Calif.
 L. S. Broom Co., Los Angeles, Calif.
 Valley Broom & Mop Co., Marysville, Calif.
 Derrick Broom Factory, San Jose, Calif.
 Zan Manufacturing Co., Gardena, Calif.
 Jackie C. Johnston, Arlington, Calif.
 Denver Broom Co., Denver, Colo.
 Charles Lund, Denver, Colo.
 George Rutherford, Springfield, Colo.
 La Salle Broom Co., Orlando, Fla.
 H. F. Root & Son, West Palm Beach, Fla.
 Lutz Broom & Mop Co., Lutz, Fla.
 Imperial Broom Co., Tampa, Fla.
 Gate City Broom Co., Jacksonville, Fla.
 Smoky Mountain Broom Co., Miami, Fla.
 The Dinsmore Co., Jacksonville, Fla.
 Palmetto Brush & Whisk Co., Jacksonville, Fla.
 Bassett Broom Works, Orlando, Fla.
 B. N. Harris, West Palm Beach, Fla.
 O. Campbell, West Palm Beach, Fla.
 Clark Broom & Brush Works, Chicago, Ill.
 Merkle Broom Co., Paris, Ill.
 Progress Duster Co., Chicago, Ill.
 Kankakee Broom Factory, Bourbonnais, Ill.
 Plow City Broom Co., Moline, Ill.
 J. A. Galligan Co., Chicago, Ill.
 Harry E. Kellogg, Rome, Ill.
 Blakely Broom Co., Charleston, Ill.
 Nate Anthony, West Frankfort, Ill.
 Kenneth C. Riley, Danvers, Ill.
 Martie Stevens, Windsor, Ill.
 W. R. Teets, Lewisville, Ill.
 Joseph Lay Co., Inc., Portland, Ind.
 J. J. McIntosh Sons Corp., Tipton, Ind.
 Indianapolis Brush & Broom Manufacturing Co., Indianapolis, Ind.
 Linton Broom Co., Linton, Ind.
 Clore Manufacturing Co., Indianapolis, Ind.
 Terre Haute Broom Co., Terre Haute, Ind.
 Curtis Craft, Reelsville, Ind.
 Charles Boes, Tipton, Ind.
 Burlington Broom Co., Burlington, Iowa.
 Pittman Broom Co., Des Moines, Iowa.
 Iowa Broom Works, Sioux City, Iowa.
 United States Broom Co., Davenport, Iowa.
 Little Pelton Broom Co., Des Moines, Iowa.
 Iowa Blind Products, Inc., Des Moines, Iowa.
 Keystone Brooms, Keokuk, Iowa.
 M. & S. Broom Works, Salina, Kans.
 Criss Broom Co., Arkansas City, Kans.
 Fred Timma, Lebanon, Kans.
 United Broom Co., Kansas City, Kans.
 Jones Broom Works, Louisville, Ky.
 Reynolds Broom Co., Hazard, Ky.
 Carter & Co., Louisville, Ky.
 Loomis Broom Co., Covington, Ky.
 Herschel Work Broom Co., Lexington, Ky.
 J. J. Repetto Broom Works, Louisville, Ky.
 Theford's Broom & Mop Factory, Monroe, La.
 Avoyelles Broom Factory, Goudeau, La.
 Leo Babino, Lake Charles, La.
 Ellis Badeaux, New Iberia, La.
 Muller-Broussard, Lafayette, La.
 Dixie Broom & Mop Co., Lafayette, La.
 Joseph Solleau, Ville Platte, La.
 Eugene A. Porter, Baton Rouge, La.
 Rev. E. W. Sims, New Orleans, La.

H. J. Speyrer, Leonville, La.
 Alphonse Stutes, Lafayette, La.
 Henry Traub, New Orleans, La.
 D. Wendling, New Orleans, La.
 Opelousas Broom Works, Opelousas, La.
 A. Guiteriez Broom & Mop Co., New Orleans, La.
 Lee L. Acou, Lockport, La.
 Franklin Broom Co., Brandywine, Md.
 Joseph Gaydos, Baltimore, Md.
 Eagle Broom Works, Thurmont, Md.
 Useful Broom Co., Baltimore, Md.
 Martin I. Hartman, Baltimore, Md.
 S. A. Ripple & Bros., Inc., Baltimore, Md.
 Cub-Hill-Mop & Specialty Co., Towson, Md.
 Lind Bros., Baltimore, Md.
 B. & F. Broom Co., New Bedford, Mass.
 Ideal Broom Manufacturing Co., Turner Falls, Mass.
 University Broom Co., Somerville, Mass.
 Sugarman Bros., Cambridge, Mass.
 Maiden Mop & Brush Co., Everett, Mass.
 Arthur Juliano, Revere, Mass.
 LaSalle Broom Co., Edwardsburg, Mich.
 Superior Mop & Broom Manufacturers, Detroit, Mich.
 Charles Manzelmann, Detroit, Mich.
 Kiddie Brush & Toy Co., Jonesville, Mich.
 Best Broom Manufacturing Co., Detroit, Mich.
 Hudson Broom Co., Hudson, Mich.
 Wyandotte Broom Works, Wyandotte, Mich.
 Eureka Broom Co., Detroit, Mich.
 Danzik Broom Manufacturing Co., Battle Creek, Mich.
 Vixie Broom Works, Berrien Springs, Mich.
 Michigan Broom Co., Bay City, Mich.
 Home-Aids, Hillsdale, Mich.
 Lineer Broom Manufacturing Co., St. Paul, Minn.
 Smith Broom Co., St. Cloud, Minn.
 Belmont Broom Co., Belmont, Miss.
 E. C. Humes, Hattiesburg, Miss.
 George Hill, Hattiesburg, Miss.
 M. & M. Broom Factory, Petal, Miss.
 Luther Rayman, Minter City, Miss.
 C. C. Pryor, Meridian, Miss.
 Clarence Tillman, Meridian, Miss.
 G. N. Welch, Gulfport, Miss.
 Klondike Broom & Mop Co., Sanford, Miss.
 Heblon Broom Factory, Meridian, Miss.
 John Dale, Sedalia, Mo.
 Missouri Broom Manufacturing Co., St. Louis, Mo.
 St. Louis Broom Co., St. Louis, Mo.
 C. E. Classer, Kansas City, Mo.
 Progressive Broom Manufacturing Co., St. Louis, Mo.
 Central Broom Co., Jefferson City, Mo.
 E. M. Hayes, Fortuna, Mo.
 Hebron Broom Co., Hebron, Nebr.
 F. J. Maher, Hebron, Nebr.
 Capital Broom Works, Lincoln, Nebr.
 Simpson Broom Works, Norfolk, Nebr.
 Quality Broom Factory, Berlin, N.J.
 R. & B. Broom Works, Blackwood, N.J.
 Fred Thompson, Jr., West Branch, N.J.
 Sandia View Academy Broom Factory, Sandoval, N. Mex.
 Paul Zamora, Albuquerque, N. Mex.
 M. T. Brown, Hagerman, N. Mex.
 E.N.Y. Broom Co., Brooklyn, N.Y.
 Philip's Broom Shop, Lockport, N.Y.
 Noxon Broom Co., Avoca, N.Y.
 Whitmyre Broom Co., Schenectady, N.Y.
 Schwartz Broom Co., Rochester, N.Y.
 J. Brooks Co., Brooklyn, N.Y.
 Parish Broom & Brush Co., Syracuse, N.Y.
 C. C. Gerhardt, New York City, N.Y.
 Service Broom Co., Brooklyn, N.Y.
 Amalgam Manufacturing Co., Valley Stream, Long Island, N.Y.
 Andrew Lerch, Buffalo, N.Y.
 Ramseur Broom Works, Ramseur, N.C.
 Guilford Broom Co., Guilford, N.C.
 Loftin Broom Works, Norwood, N.C.
 Padgett Broom Works, Gastonia, N.C.
 Blue Ridge Enterprises, Lenoir, N.C.
 McElveen Manufacturing Co., Gastonia, N.C.
 Mount Pisgah Academy, Leandler, N.C.

Buile Broom Co., Denton, N.C.
 Cawa Brooms, Inc., Thomasville, N.C.
 Guilford Broom Works, Guilford College, N.C.
 Playworld Toys, Inc., Statesville, N.C.
 Setser Manufacturing Co., Lenoir, N.C.
 W. G. Surratt & Son, Denton, N.C.
 C. V. Van Hook, Brown Summit, N.C.
 Joe L. Hawkins, Forest City, N.C.
 Thomasville Broom Co., Thomasville, N.C.
 Conover Broom Corp., Conover, N.C.
 Norman R. Congleton, New Philadelphia, Ohio.
 Ezra Sparks, Wheelersburg, Ohio.
 Sunshine Broom & Brush Co., Cleveland, Ohio.
 Euclid Broom Manufacturing Co., Euclid, Ohio.
 Sugarcreek Broom Co., Sugarcreek, Ohio.
 American Textile Products Co., Cleveland, Ohio.
 Johnson Broom Co., Akron, Ohio.
 Portage Broom & Brush Co., Akron, Ohio.
 M. G. Goeller's Sons Co., Circleville, Ohio.
 Midwest Broom Manufacturing Co., Circleville, Ohio.
 Kelley Manufacturing Co., Urbana, Ohio.
 B. & R. Industries, Columbus, Ohio.
 Johnson Broom Co., Toledo, Ohio.
 J. & L. Broom Co., Toledo, Ohio.
 James A. Burnette, Gallipolis, Ohio.
 Dan Kaufman, McClure, Ohio.
 C. M. Erbaugh, Verona, Ohio.
 Muldrow Broom Manufacturing, Muldrow, Okla.
 E.Z. Sweep Broom Co., Oklahoma City, Okla.
 Parks Broom Co., Lawton, Okla.
 Ripley Broom Co., Ripley, Okla.
 Oklahoma Broom Co., Enid, Okla.
 El Reno Broom Co., El Reno, Okla.
 A. J. Shires, Moore, Okla.
 J. W. Sultor, Grants Pass, Oreg.
 Lester M. Ulrich, Lititz, Pa.
 Steel City Broom Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.
 Better Broom & Whisk Manufacturers, Philadelphia, Pa.
 C. Day Broom Co., Millersburg, Pa.
 S. W. Good, Terre Hill, Pa.
 William L. Swartz, Philadelphia, Pa.
 M. B. Fisher, Gordonville, Pa.
 Evergreen Broom Manufacturing Co., Inc., Pittsburgh, Pa.
 Union Novelty Manufacturing Co., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Pittsburgh Broom Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.
 Merich Broom & Mop Shop, Saltsburg, Pa.
 Sandruck Broom Shop, Hanover, Pa.
 Baden Broom & Mop Co., Baden, Pa.
 Mercer Broom Co., Mercer, Pa.
 W.T. & I.F. Rath Broom Factory, Union City, Pa.
 Keystone Broom Works, Millersburg, Pa.
 Atlas Broom Co., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Association for the Blind, Johnstown, Pa.
 Swartz Broom Factory, Harrisburg, Pa.
 Quaker City Broom Works, Philadelphia, Pa.
 Dickson Broom Manufacturing Co., Philadelphia, Pa.
 Nelson Epler, Reading, Pa.
 Anstine Broom Co., York, Pa.
 Sam Leaman, Cross Hill, S.C.
 Kleen Sweep Broom Co., Greenwood, S.C.
 William M. Smith, Ware Shoals, S.C.
 Green Broom & Mop Co., Inc., Greenwood, S.C.
 Mouchet Bros., Starr, S.C.
 American Broom Co., Jackson, Tenn.
 Jackson Broom & Mop Co., Jackson, Tenn.
 North Side Broom Works, Memphis, Tenn.
 Truman Carter & Son Broom Co., Madison, Tenn.
 Nashville Broom & Mop Co., Nashville, Tenn.
 Chattanooga Broom Co., Chattanooga, Tenn.
 Moody Broom Co., Nashville, Tenn.
 F. R. Morton Broom Co., Nashville, Tenn.
 Conway Broom Works, Clifton, Tenn.
 Atkins Broom Co., Chattanooga, Tenn.

Bilbrey Broom Works, Nashville, Tenn.
Watson Broom Works, Nashville, Tenn.
Hermitage Broom & Mop Co., Nashville, Tenn.

Hopkins Broom Co., Nashville, Tenn.
Pulaski Broom Works, Lawrenceburg, Tenn.
Davis-Well Manufacturing Co., Inc., Memphis, Tenn.

Clifton Broom Co., Clifton, Tenn.
Acme Broom & Mop Factory, Houston, Tex.

Texas Broom Works, San Antonio, Tex.
M. L. Sandefur Broom Factory, Keene, Tex.
Houston Broom Factory, Houston, Tex.

Nu-Broom Co., Inc., Edroy, Tex.
Walls Broom & Mop Factory, Bowie, Tex.

Terrell Broom Factory, Terrell, Tex.
Tompkins Broom & Mop Co., Cisco, Tex.

Amarillo Broom & Mop Co., Amarillo, Tex.
R. A. Eason Co., Grand Prairie, Tex.

Panhandle Broom Co., Dalhart, Tex.
Sealy Broom Co., Sealy, Tex.

Gonzalo Ancira, Irving, Tex.
Parker Broom Co., Huntsville, Tex.

Dallas Broom & Mop Co., Dallas, Tex.
Southland Broom Co., Inc., Texarkana, Tex.

Lone Star Broom & Mop Factory, San Antonio, Tex.

Evant Broom & Mop Co., Evant, Tex.
Cisco Broom & Mop Factory, Cisco, Tex.

Nelson Broom Factory, San Antonio, Tex.
J. R. Young Broom & Mop Co., Keene, Tex.

Star State Broom & Mop Co., Cisco, Tex.
Alamo Broom Factory, San Antonio, Tex.

Lawrence Broom & Mop Co., League City, Tex.

Round Rock Broom Works, Round Rock, Tex.

J. A. Turner Broom Factory, San Antonio, Tex.

Ablene Broom & Mop Co., Abilene, Tex.
John Moughan, Abilene, Tex.

Morgan Bros. Mop & Broom Co., Dallas, Tex.

Spikes Bros., Terrell, Tex.
Central Texas Broom & Mop Co., Houston, Tex.

Ward Broom Co., Cisco, Tex.
C. E. Tillotson, Ogden, Utah.

Richey Broom Co., Salt Lake City, Utah.
Academy Brooms, New Market, Va.

A. W. Compton, Emory, Va.
Imperial Broom Co., Richmond, Va.

Bauer & Co., Inc., Portsmouth, Va.
Quality Brooms, Bristol, Va.

Ball Manufacturing Co., Bristol, Va.
Kingtown Broom Co., Bristol, Va.

F. S. Bolton, Monroe, Wash.
Garland Broom Co., Washougal, Wash.

Hanset Broom Co., Seattle, Wash.
Huffman Broom Works, Ballengee, W. Va.

William Singleton, Webster Springs, W. Va.

Miller Broom Co., LaCrosse, Wis.
Arthur's Reliable Broom, Milwaukee, Wis.

Chair City Broom Co., Sheboygan, Wis.
M. & M. Broom Manufacturing Co., Milwaukee, Wis.

Vining Broom Co. of Wisconsin, Wausau, Wis.

Strassburg Manufacturing Co., Milwaukee, Wis.

Ed C. Feldman, Kaukauna, Wis.
Chair City Broom Co., Sheboygan, Wis.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, this matter was so serious that the Tariff Commission undertook a study in 1960 and found that the cost differential between the making of brooms in Mexico and in the United States was \$5.24 a dozen.

Of course it is worse now, because costs have risen since then. Should that situation continue, it will mean the end of an industry. Many factories are small, employing only a few people. A great many broom factories are operated by

the blind. Some colleges maintain broom factories in which students without funds can learn the broom trade and thus work their way through college.

Because of this great disparity, the American consumer was suffering. Competition became so vicious that it was not in the public interest. For instance, instead of using broomcorn, which is time-proven for its strength and its quality in making a good broom, substitutes were used, such as bear grass and the sotol plant. These materials would not last. I know of one instance in which a great national business concern purchased American-made brooms for use in sweeping out its own stores, but sold inferior foreign imports to the American public.

I am glad that in the compromise we have some measure of protection. Because of that, I shall support it.

In connection with the work of the Tariff Commission, and for the information of the Senate, I should like to have incorporated in my remarks certain paragraphs from the report of the Committee on Finance, as marked on pages 22 and 23.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On June 30, 1960, representatives of the domestic broom industry filed an application with the Tariff Commission for an investigation of brooms, whiskbrooms, and toy brooms made of broomcorn, under the provisions of section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930. The application alleged that the 25-percent duty did not equalize the costs of production of the comparable products made in the United States and foreign countries, and the domestic industry requested that the rate of duty on the imported products be fixed on the basis of American selling price. After a preliminary inquiry and subsequent formal investigation, including a public hearing, the Commission on January 17, 1962, submitted to the President a report of its findings.

The Commission determined that the existing duty of 25 percent did not equalize the differences in the cost of production, and concluded that in order to equalize such differences to the fullest extent permissible under the statute, it was necessary that the present rate of duty be applied to brooms made of broomcorn on the basis of American selling price. On February 15, 1963, the President announced that he did not agree with the Tariff Commission's conclusion, and consequently the duty on the subject of brooms was not changed.

This section which has been added to the bill by your committee would make brooms made wholly or in part of broomcorn and valued at not over 96 cents each dutiable at 24 cents each in the case of brooms other than whiskbrooms. The duty on whiskbrooms made wholly or in part of broomcorn and valued at not over 32 cents each would be 8 cents each. Other brooms made wholly or in part of broomcorn would continue to be dutiable at 25 percent ad valorem.

Your committee is convinced that his adjustment in duty is justified by the findings of the Tariff Commission in its formal investigation. The specific rates provided by this amendment would yield duty of \$2.88 per dozen for floor brooms and 96 cents per dozen for whiskbrooms. While these duties would still fall short of equalizing the costs of production, as found by the Tariff Commission, between brooms manufactured in the United States and imported brooms, your committee believes that the rates provided in the bill will be of substantial benefit to the

domestic industry. (The report of the Tariff Commission indicated that on the basis of the weighted average of all brooms for 1960, the difference in the cost of production of United States and Mexican brooms was \$5.42.)

No trade-agreement concession on brooms made wholly or in part of broomcorn is presently in force. Accordingly, the enactment of this provision would not conflict with international obligations of the United States as currently in effect.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, what the compromise amounts to is that a quota will be established, and the quota will be an annual quota of 320,000 dozen brooms. That quota is broken down as follows: 205,000 dozen ordinary brooms. On those brooms there will be a 20-percent tariff, which is very insignificant. Above the basic 205,000 dozen, there will be, on brooms costing 96 cents or more, a 32-percent ad valorem duty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. On brooms costing less than 96 cents, there will be a tax of 32 cents for each broom.

The compromise also calls for the importation of 115,000 whiskbrooms. On the 115,000 the tariff shall be 20 percent.

On whiskbrooms priced at 32 cents or more, there will be a 32-percent ad valorem tax. If it is less than 32 cents, there will be a tax of 12 cents on each broom.

Before I agreed to this amendment, after the fine, capable people on the staff had worked on it, and the distinguished Senator from New York and the distinguished Senator from California had worked on it, I asked if I might have a statement from the State Department, because they are interested in all these trade matters.

The distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] conferred with some of these people. Then he called on the telephone Assistant Secretary Sullivan, and called me to the phone. We discussed it briefly. I asked one of the staff members who had worked on all the details to discuss the matter further with Mr. Sullivan, so that there would be no misunderstanding as to what we were agreeing to.

I returned to the telephone, and Mr. Sullivan said, "This compromise has the support of the State Department."

I asked him if the State Department would support it in conference. He replied in the affirmative.

Senators may rely upon the fact that what is being done here has the support of the State Department. I am very happy that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], has been present and has participated in the discussion and has added his approval.

When we go to a quota system, it means that every broom imported will have to be counted. This is a little different from gathering statistics on imports in connection with which no quota exists. Sometimes individuals will come in with a small number of a certain article, and they will pay the tariff, but these articles are not compiled statistically. When a

quota is established, every import has to be counted. Therefore, our agreement to the compromise is based upon the fact that every broom imported will be counted.

I am not talking about someone who carries one broom in his hand, or a whiskbroom in his traveling bag. However, when an automobile or a pickup truck brings in 100 brooms or 200 brooms or 250 brooms, or less than 250 brooms, they are to be counted and included in this quota.

I am grateful for the small amount of protection that the compromise affords. I shall support it. I know it is in the best interest both of this country and of Mexico. We import three times as much broomcorn from Mexico as we do brooms. If the broom industry in this country dies, Mexico will lose a customer for a great amount of broomcorn. I believe they should welcome this compromise, and I shall support it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the senior Senator from Nebraska.

PROTECT THE AMERICAN BROOM INDUSTRY

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, favorable action on H.R. 7969 including section 80 which provides protection to the domestic broom industry is essential to sustain the domestic industry against the increasing flow of foreign-made brooms which have been steadily taking over our domestic market and depriving our own people of their means of livelihood.

This bill as reported by the Senate Finance Committee contained an amendment sponsored by my colleague from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] identical to his bill S. 1083 imposing certain minimum rates of duty on imported brooms. A compromise on that amendment has now been worked out between the proponents and opponents, which will give equal protection and also smoothe the further progress of this legislation toward final passage, and assure that it will be accepted by the other body as well as the Senate.

My colleague deserves special praise for his diligence and leadership in sponsoring this provision to preserve the domestic industry. For several years he has taken the lead among those of us from the 44 broom-producing States who were interested in helping the industry. He is also to be commended for his practical statesmanship in working out and accepting the compromise language on brooms which is to be contained in the bill as finally passed. We can thereby be assured that the victory being won today in the Senate will not be lost in the House tomorrow, but that protection for brooms will still be a part of this bill in the version finally enacted.

The broom industry is not a tremendous industry in terms of wealth and influence, but it is widely spread, being composed of 475 factories located in 44 States. It is a major source of employment in many of the towns where the plants are located, and it is the only market for the farmer's output of broomcorn. The industry is of particular importance as a means of providing employment for the blind, since it has been

found that those without vision or with other handicaps can be trained to make brooms, and thereby find a means of honorable livelihood.

Certain spokesmen for the administration are fond of saying that those thrown out of their jobs by competitive imports should readjust, should be prepared to learn new skills and change their occupations. That is easy enough for a bureaucrat to say. But think of the heartbreak involved for a handicapped person who has been able to learn one skill, perhaps only with the greatest difficulty, and who then finds his employment snatched away from him by some grand national policy too vast to understand his personal problem.

The broom industry deserves our special consideration because it has opened up opportunities for these people.

In opposition to this proposal, it has been argued that imports are as yet only a small factor in the market. I do not believe this is so. The value figures on imports reported by the census are not great—precisely because the imports are priced so low, but for that same reason the competition of such imports is doubly destructive. Total value of imports amounts to only 2 or 3 percent of the domestic value of production, but in numbers the imports apparently amount to about 15 percent of domestic production. In other words, imports of a little over \$1 million may displace \$5 million of domestic brooms.

Furthermore, imports have been increasing at a frightening rate. As recently as 1956, broom imports from all sources were less than 100,000 dozen; in 1964, they were over 400,000. Nor do all of these brooms come from our southern neighbor, Mexico. About two-thirds of them come from other sources, and in 2 out of the last 6 years, Hungary, not Mexico, was the leading foreign supplier.

It will be said that by strengthening the protection of this small industry, we are flying in the face of our trade agreements policy. But the United States has not made any trade-agreement concession in the tariff rate on brooms. In fact, Mexico—usually the principal foreign supplier—has not shown any interest in negotiating a trade agreement with us, or in becoming a member of GATT and thereby participating in negotiations to reduce tariffs, including its own. As a matter of fact, the Mexican duties on American brooms and broomcorn are far higher than the American duties on foreign brooms proposed here. The principal beneficiaries of the present low duty on brooms are Mexico and two Iron Curtain countries, Hungary and Poland.

We are not obligated to pursue a liberal trade policy on behalf of those foreign countries which refuse to reciprocate, to the harm of our own industries. I hope the Senate will accept this proposal for protection of the broom industry and pass this bill.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 seconds to thank my friends. I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield myself 30 seconds. I shall not burden the Senate by going into a detailed explanation of my views. I am prepared to agree to the suggested compromise.

I ask unanimous consent that certain excerpts from the debate which occurred on this subject last year be printed in the RECORD at this time.

Mr. JAVITS. Are those the excerpts that relate to my amendment?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the debate were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if there is one amendment that does not need any further study it is the amendment before the Senate. We can decide, if we wish to do so, to let the small businesses in America continue to manufacture brooms, or to run them out of business. If Senators wish to run them out of business, go ahead and accept the amendment. If Senators wish to permit 345 small businesses manufacturing brooms to remain in business, then vote against the proposal offered by the Senator from California to strike out the committee amendment.

The facts show that between 1953 and 1958 there were 450 broom manufacturers in America who went out of business because down in Mexico, and in other foreign countries, brooms can be manufactured much cheaper than they can be manufactured in this country. Mexico can do so because of its low labor cost. We cannot compete with brooms manufactured in Mexico. We have remaining, 345 small businesses engaged in that production. What could those small businesses do?

They went to the Tariff Commission and asked for help. They explained their plight. The Tariff Commission recommended that we give them a tariff based upon the American selling price, which would have permitted them to continue in business.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I shall yield in a few moments. Other Senators have been discussing the subject for an hour or so, and I should like to say a few words at this time.

The Tariff Commission recommended that the domestic manufacturers obtain appropriate relief. Unfortunately, the State Department felt that the proposal might conflict with trade negotiations. What we have here would not in anywise conflict with GATT. The State Department has taken the Mexican side; the Tariff Commission has taken the side of the domestic industry.

Mr. President, we can leave the domestic industries in business or we can put them out of business. It is that simple.

These people are being run out in large numbers. A few are left. There are about 19 factories left in Illinois, which is so ably represented by the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the minority leader. Sixteen broom factories are left in North Carolina; about 12 factories are left in Pennsylvania; California and Texas have about 9 factories each. So a few are left.

But the disparity is so great between the Mexican cost of manufacture and the American cost that the American producers cannot survive if we do not give them the proposed protection.

We have heard a great deal of crying on the floor of the Senate about how we must not discriminate against Mexico. We have heard that we must not raise the tariff against an industry in Mexico if Mexico wishes to ship us some commodity.

What has Mexico done to our broom manufacturers? Mexico has a tariff of \$4.50 a

dozen on brooms and her price is half of ours. What do we charge Mexico? \$1.01 a dozen.

Mr. President, no country on earth, except ours, is ashamed to say, "We have a legitimate and respected industry which is being driven out by foreign competition and we have a duty to protect and look after our own. Charity begins at home."

How long did it take the Common Market in Europe to decide to do what it did to us in respect to chickens? They took the chicken market away from us, which was a direct violation of their pledged word given to our country.

The proposal would not be in violation of an agreement.

Mexico made an agreement with us in relation to oil on a most-favored-nation basis. She made a trade compact with us, and she agreed that she would live up to certain obligations in respect to oil. One of them was not to confiscate or to nationalize American investments down there. She proceeded to break her word with us and nationalized our investments and discriminated against our imports. Notwithstanding that action, we made a trade agreement with Venezuela to reduce the tariff on oil and gave Mexico the benefit of it, although Mexico is in violation of her pledged word in other respects on trade agreements.

What we have proposed is something which any other nation under the sun would do if it had a similar problem.

Representatives of the industry went to the Tariff Commission. The Tariff Commission studied the problem and recommended relief. Two years ago we passed a bill which would have given the people in the industry the kind of relief that the Tariff Commission recommended, but it was in a form that was more objectionable to the State Department than the language we now propose, because then the action was based upon the American selling price.

The State Department very much objected to that. But when we impose a tariff of a specific amount on an item in order to more nearly equalize the costs of manufacturing brooms in the two countries than the present duty, we are told that it is wrong, even though it is not as much as we did 2 years ago.

More people are involved than the manufacturers of brooms. There are thousands of blind people in this country. One of the few things that blind people can do to make a few dollars is to make brooms. Blind people make brooms and make a few dollars out of the work. Do Senators wish to let them make a few dollars or do they wish to put those blind people out of business?

One of the few things that a prisoner can be taught to do so that he can learn an occupation and find work on the outside is to put brooms together, sitting in a prison cell. Here is a letter from a prisoner who desires parole. He must say that he can make a living, and he must demonstrate that he is not likely to return to theft or committing some kind of robbery in order to make a living when he gets out of the penitentiary. He is looking for an opportunity to make a few brooms. That is one skill that a person can learn while he is still a prisoner in a prison cell. He is urging us to let the broom industry stay in business because he had an opportunity to learn how to manufacture brooms in prison and wants to follow that work when he gets out.

We can put all those people out of business if we wish to do so. We can turn down our blind people. We can say that Mexico is more important, even though it has broken its word, and we can give it every advantage. We are afraid to give our people the same protection that Mexico gives hers. We can do that. We can turn our backs on the domestic industry. We can turn our backs on our blind people. We can turn our backs on the

prisoners who are trying to rehabilitate themselves, and we can say, "Mexico must come first. It can do anything it wishes. It can break its word, but we would not think of breaking ours." If Senators wish to take that view, they are entitled to do so.

Furthermore, I point out that the Mexicans are not the only people in the broom business. Communist countries are in the business. Hungary is in the broom business; Poland is in the broom business. While we would be attempting to protect Mexico, we would be looking after those communistic countries. Why are Senators turning their backs on their own?

The amendment has been considered by the Senate previously. It has been agreed to by the Senate before. It has been recommended by the Tariff Commission. It is the kind of consideration that American people who elect us are entitled to receive. They are entitled to some kind of representation.

Mr. President, I could be a statesman on the question. So far as I know, every broom manufacturer in Louisiana has been driven out of business. I am speaking only about the other industries that might follow. We have a chart which indicates that there might be two left in Louisiana, but I do not think that there are any left, for I have not heard from any in my State. They have all been run out.

There are a few broom industries left in Illinois. The Senator from Illinois has a good case. The Tariff Commission has a good case. The Senate has a good case. I would say that if we cannot provide this little protection to 345 small businesses in America, if we cannot provide for this minimal amount of help, to give the people in that industry a tariff so as to more nearly equalize the cost between American-made and Mexican-made brooms—if we cannot give them that kind of protection when Mexico has had more than a \$4 tariff on our brooms, and their cost is half of ours—why are we so ashamed to vote some kind of protection for our own industry?

We can go to conference, if this is voted, and see if the House will not agree, after the conferees consider it, to some reasonable sort of protection.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate on the amendment has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the minority leader, I yield back the remainder of his time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 7969) was passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to correct certain errors in the Tariff Schedules of the United States, and for other purposes."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments to the bill (H.R. 7969) and ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. BENNETT conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H.R. 7969) be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered; and that in the engrossment of the amendments of the Senate to the bill the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make all necessary technical and clerical changes and corrections, including corrections in section, subsection, and so forth, designations, and cross references thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate has just passed another important bill, the tariff schedules technical amendments, reported out by the efficient and very hard-working Senate Finance Committee. This measure, perfecting tariff schedules, closing certain tariff loopholes, and changing the rate of duty on a number of products, was a highly complex bill involving numerous commodities. Its passage required skillful management on the floor, broad understanding, and a willingness to work out needed compromises.

I congratulate those who managed the bill, as well as those who proposed and worked out amendments. My special praise goes to the skilled and distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], who had primary responsibility on the floor. He was more than capably assisted in this task by the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the majority whip, and the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Passage of the bill would not have gone as smoothly as it did were it not for the cooperative efforts from the other side of the aisle in the person of the able and distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the ranking Republican member of the Finance Committee.

Finally, and by no means to be minimized, I congratulate the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], all of whom worked vigorously and cooperatively on amendments to make this measure a better piece of legislation.

I commend again the entire Senate Finance Committee and the entire Senate for the fine effort put forth to pass this important and complex measure.

NEW OUTLOOK IN LAOS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Wall Street Journal of August 12, there appears an article on the Kingdom of Laos which was written by Robert Keatley. It is a most informative description of the present state of affairs in that remote nation. Mr. Keatley draws the cautious conclusion that conditions are improved beyond what anyone might have expected a few months ago. A measure of general stability, apparently, now exists. The quality of Laotian administration is rising. Considerable economic progress is anticipated, particularly in consequence of a large-scale, rural-improvement program and a major hydroelectric dam which is projected for a site near Vientiane. The dam, incidentally, is the first project to move under the Mekong River development proposal which President Johnson advanced at Johns Hopkins University in April of this year.

The article gives a good deal of credit to Prime Minister Souvanna Phouma for these recent achievements; it is entirely deserved. Souvanna Phouma is an astute and perceptive man who appreciates both the potentials and the limitations of his country. He has given many years of his life, with great dedication and infinite patience, to the effort to give national independence meaning by bringing peace and a decent life in the modern world to the Laotian people. It is gratifying to know that his quiet and unassuming service is at last receiving some measure of the recognition which it has long deserved.

I think this article is of particular importance, Mr. President, because it underscores the advisability of avoiding opinionated absolutes in matters connected with the small nations of southeast Asia. At the same time the article is of especial significance because it also reveals the possible virtues of seeking solutions by way of negotiations to the problems of that area, however imperfect the solutions may appear to be from our point of view.

In this connection, it may be noted that in 1961 the entire Kingdom of Laos was, at most, weeks away from total collapse in the face of advancing rebel forces and we were confronted with the alternatives of participating in the negotiation of a settlement or of bulwarking a fading Laotian Army with our own forces in order to honor a commitment.

We chose the former course and, after protracted negotiations, the second Ge-

neva agreement—full of imperfections, full of uncertainties—went into effect amid many doubts and much certainty that it would mean that all Laos would soon be in the hands of the Communists.

The imperfections of that agreement are still there, Mr. President; the uncertainties are greater than ever in the light of recent developments in Vietnam. But the fact is that Laos has not collapsed into communism; the fact is that the Government at Vientiane, which we recognize, is far stronger though more moderate than the military regime which existed prior to the Geneva accord. The fact is that this Government is stronger in spite of a considerable reduction of costs in U.S. aid over the last 2 years and with considerably fewer official Americans—military and civilian—than was the case prior to the Geneva Agreement of 1962.

In short, it is worth noting that the much maligned Geneva Agreement of 1962, for all its faults, has also had some virtues in terms of rational American interests in southeast Asia. And for those who still question it, I would suggest that they ask themselves what would the situation now be in Laos without it? And how deeply and at what cost would this Nation now be involved in Laos?

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article previously referred to be printed at this point in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that a segment of a report on southeast Asia dealing with Laos which was made to President Kennedy in 1963 by Senators PELL, BOGGS, and myself, together with former Senator Smith, of Massachusetts, also be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and excerpt were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 12, 1965]

NEW OUTLOOK IN LAOS: STABLE RULE, WAR LULL COULD ALLOW PROGRESS—MEETING BEGINS TODAY TO PLAN \$45 MILLION DAM; SOUVANNA STIFFENS RESISTANCE TO REDS

(By Robert Keatley)

VIENTIANE, LAOS.—"I've fired the entire customs department from the lowest clerk to the director," says Laotian Finance Minister Sisouk Na Champassouk. "It may have reduced corruption there by 30 percent."

This guarded but hopeful assessment is typical of the improbable Kingdom of Laos these days. An unexpected degree of order, stability, and efficiency is being introduced into its affairs, at least relative to past chaos. Most non-Communist politicians and generals seem united—however reluctantly—behind the Prime Minister, Prince Souvanna Phouma. There is even serious talk of economic development in this mountainous nation where 85 percent of the people still don't use money, and where Communist rebels still control half the land area.

Two important events illustrating recent improvement in the Laotian outlook are scheduled today. Delegates of some 20 nations begin meeting here under United Nations auspices to work out construction and financing plans for a new hydroelectric dam scheduled to be built about 30 miles north of this administrative capital. The United States probably will pay half the \$45 million cost, making it the first project under President Johnson's new \$1 billion aid program for southeast Asia.

A NEW ASSEMBLY

Equally important, King Savang Vatthana today is expected to approve the recently elected national assembly which likely will assume greater legislative powers than in the past. He also is expected to reappoint the increasingly powerful Prince Souvanna as Prime Minister.

Meanwhile, the war between Government and Communist forces is at least stalemated. The royal army has driven off North Vietnamese attackers in the few battles fought this spring; as in South Vietnam, the North Vietnamese have entered the country to join local Reds. In the past, the army had a distressing habit of fleeing for the Mekong River whenever tough Vietnamese troops appeared.

In one key encounter recently, Laotian military cadets killed about 100 Vietminh (North Vietnamese) soldiers who tried a human wave assault on their school. Then the Laotian Air Force attacked the retreating Communist battalion, killing another 100. Such feats have given the Laos military an air of confidence, it's claimed, though not enough to launch any anti-Communist campaigns of its own.

Most improvements here date only from last February when Gen. Phoumi Nongsavann, Deputy Premier and once an American favorite, tried a coup that failed. He was forced to flee to Thailand, as did another past troublemaker, Gen. Sino Lanphouthacoul, chief of the paramilitary national police. The result is that much political and military discontent has disappeared. General Sino's police, for example, have turned in their mortars and tanks and even have begun directing traffic.

Since then, Prince Souvanna has asserted himself as Defense Minister (he fills that post as well as being Prime Minister), and has put together a more professional and loyal staff. Among its members is his young protégé, Finance Minister Sisouk, who formerly was delegate to the United Nations. Sisouk demands from his staff two qualities that are rare in Laotian government: Honesty and competence. He not only replaced the entire customs department but also jailed seven other civil servants for corruption.

Improvement is relative, however. Laos remains a nation of illiterate peasants led by a small, French-educated elite often concerned with personal gain. Officially, U.S. policy is aimed at making Laos viable for its own sake. More pragmatically, Uncle Sam sees an anti-Communist government here as a hindrance to the Red effort in South Vietnam and a buffer zone which helps protect Thailand.

Also, stability in Laos comes partly because the Communists haven't chosen to heat up the local war. Their main effort is in Vietnam, while Laos remains of secondary importance.

NEW PRESSURE ON REDS

But even a new Red campaign here would no longer be easy for the Communists. The Laotian Air Force and its 15 to 20 serviceable fighters, presumably helped by American jets from Thailand and South Vietnam, recently have made life miserable for the Pathet Lao, as the local Communist rebels are called.

Besides controlling half the nation's land area, the Reds still govern a fourth of Laos' roughly 2.4 million people. But Communist forces are confined mostly to valleys and roads, making them vulnerable to air attacks and raids by American-armed hill tribesmen who resent efforts to upset their traditional way of life.

"This is one place where the guerrillas are on our side," says an American official.

Neutralist Prince Souvanna has become increasingly disgusted with the Pathet Lao, whose nominal leader is his half brother, Prince Souphanouvong, and with North Viet-

name as who actually control the movement. He has finally decided after years of hoping otherwise that the Pathet Lao rebels are totally disinterested in creating an effective neutral government for the whole Nation. He has also realized that Communist China (which now administers Laos' northernmost province) refuses to consider any Laotian settlement separate from one in South Vietnam. He had hoped Laos could remain a bystander in the assault on what once was Indochina.

The Reds still insist on the "troika" government envisioned in the 1962 Geneva agreement on Laos. Such tripartite government of Communists, neutralists, and anti-Communists would give the Reds veto power and would paralyze the Central Government, thus permitting them to subvert the Mekong River region where their power is weak. But Prince Souvanna is moving ahead with a unified coalition of neutralists and rightists.

THAI RELATIONS IMPROVE

One major benefit from the new unit is improved relations between Laos and Thailand. The two nations share a 1,100-mile border. The anti-Communist Thai long have been suspicious of Prince Souvanna's motives, but now have decided he is basically on their side.

Thailand has agreed in principle to buy electric power from the proposed Nam Ngum dam that would be built with U.S. aid. Construction of the dam seems assured with completion by 1970; the dam is considered both politically and economically important to whatever future Laos has. Despite 10 years of American aid, the country has no sizable project to show for it. Most funds have gone for Government salaries, rice, bullets, a few rutted roads and, some suspect, into numbered Swiss bank accounts of unscrupulous officials.

It is claimed that sale to Thailand of some of the 60,000-kilowatt output of the dam would bolster Laotian morale and political prestige and earn valuable foreign exchange. Laotian exports now are almost nil except for an estimated \$3.5 million worth of smuggled opium yearly. The United States must supply 50,000 tons of rice a year to feed the nation. However, a rural assistance program hopes to eliminate the rice deficit in 5 years. Meanwhile, power from the dam could reduce further the need for aid and foster small-scale industry here.

All this assumes Laos will continue to exist outside the Communist orbit, an assumption that depends more on what happens in Vietnam than on events here. But the current progress, however limited, is something few observers would have predicted even 6 months ago.

LAOS

Background

In contrast to Vietnam, policies since 1961 have involved a lightening of commitment in Laos. As in Vietnam, the United States began to supply aid to Laos about a decade ago. In the early years, this burden was shared with the French. The aid went to a government headed by the then Prime Minister Souvanna Phouma whose internal policy succeeded in bringing about partial integration of the dissident Pathet Lao political faction headed by his half brother Prince Souphanouvong. Various U.S. aid and other activities increased in the kingdom. At the same time the French role declined. Once again, an internal political divisiveness appeared. Souvanna Phouma was compelled to withdraw from the government. There followed the coups and countercoups of 1959-60 which ended with an anti-Communist military government in control in the administrative capital of Vientiane. Its position, however, was challenged by two other factions, the Pathet Lao looking to the Viet-

minh of North Vietnam for support and by a group under a U.S. trained military officer, Kong Le, which advocated the return of Souvanna Phouma to the government. By that time, U.S. agencies had assumed almost total responsibility for outside assistance to the military government in power in Vientiane.

The U.S. involvement

The growth in U.S. personnel in Laos and the overall cost of military and other aid to that country is indicative of the rapid engrossment of the United States in internal Laotian affairs. From a total of two American officials permanently stationed in all of Laos in 1953,¹ the number of U.S. personnel rose to 850 at its height in 1961, a total which has now declined to 250. Through the years 1955-62, the United States provided over \$450 million in aid of all kinds to Laos.

In relation to the size and nature of the country this aid effort has been more intense than anywhere else in the world. Laos has only 2.5 million inhabitants, most of whom live in scattered and primitive villages. The land is located in one of the most remote regions of Asia and is largely covered with inaccessible jungle. A decade ago, political leadership on a national scale was nonexistent. Politics centered on the small group of intellectuals in the administrative capital of Vientiane, with ramifications reaching to the Royal Court in Luang Prabang. In 1953, the Laotian Army had two battalions in process of formation, less than a thousand men in all. There were also several hundred Pathet Lao dissidents under arms in the northeast. Outside its immediate neighbors and France, the existence of the Kingdom of Laos as a political entity was almost totally unknown abroad.

Yet scarcely a decade later, 100,000 Laotians were bearing arms. There were three major military factions engaged in conflict. The peaceful little Buddhist kingdom had become both a mirror reflecting the principal ideological stresses of our times and a bloody setting for international competition and intrigue on a massive scale. The transition had gone so far by the spring of 1961 that this Nation was compelled to consider seriously the possibility of a major and direct military involvement of U.S. forces in Laos, with overtones not unlike those of the Korean conflict.

There were, however, different characteristics in the Laotian situation which held some promise that a satisfactory solution to the problem could be achieved through negotiations. An international conference of 14 nations was convened in Geneva on the Laotian question in an effort to find a peaceful solution along lines which had long been advocated by Cambodia. Fourteen months later on July 23, 1962, an agreement was signed by the participating nations and a measure of peace returned to the embattled kingdom.

The current situation

The signatories of the Geneva accord of 1962 pledged themselves to respect the neutrality of Laos and not to interfere in its internal affairs. In addition, they promised to withdraw such military forces as they had in Laos and not to use the territory of Laos for interference in the internal affairs of other countries.

Concomitant with the Geneva agreement, the leaders of the three principal Laotian political factions agreed to establish a unified government and administration under the King. The key figures in the latter settlement were Prince Souvanna Phouma who,

having served as the first Prime Minister of an independent Laos, became Prime Minister once again in the provisional government. He was joined in the new government by Prince Souphanouvong, his half-brother and the leader of the northern dissidents, and by Gen. Phoumi Nasavan, leader of a southern faction, who had had close ties with Thailand and U.S. executive agencies.

It is too soon to judge the efficacy of the international and Laotian accords which have been introduced into the situation. Insofar as the larger powers are concerned, U.S. forces have been withdrawn in keeping with the agreement. On the basis of available information, there are neither Soviet Russian nor Chinese forces in Laos in violation of the agreement. But there is every likelihood that Vietminh forces are still present among the Pathet Lao, and there are allegations that foreign elements are also active in other military factions.

Responsibility for determining that all foreign forces have been withdrawn from Laos rests with an International Control Commission. But this group of Indians, Canadians, and Poles has yet to carry out the responsibility, largely because of disagreement among the factions within the provisional government.

This is but one example of the difficulties besetting the government of Prime Minister Souvanna Phouma, which operates on the principle of unanimity of the three factions on matters of significance. There are many others. In particular, there is the problem of military demobilization. An agreement in principle has been reached to reduce the total of more than 100,000 men under arms in Laos to a national force of 30,000 and a police force of 6,000 drawn equally from the three major factions. As of the time of our visit, however, the agreement was still awaiting action. There has also been sporadic violations of the cease-fire directed especially at Meo tribes people in Pathet Lao controlled territory. And American planes have even been shot down while carrying relief supplies to isolated troops at the request of the Prime Minister.

Present U.S. policies

It is the policy of the United States, as expressed by the President, to support fully both the Geneva agreement of 1962 and the efforts of Prime Minister Souvanna to establish a unified government in Laos. In keeping with the Geneva accords, the United States has already withdrawn its military aid mission personnel of 650 as well as 400 Filipino contract technicians.

At the same time, and at the request of the Prime Minister, the United States is supplying maintenance material to the armed forces under the control of General Phoumi and those responsive to Souvanna Phouma and has offered to assist in the orderly demobilization of the military when it becomes feasible. The United States is also continuing economic help to the Laotian Government, but the program is shifting from aid designed to permit the economy to sustain large military burdens to aid designed essentially to help in reconstruction and development, with stress on education.

In effect, United States Laotian policy is now acting to extricate this Nation in an orderly fashion from the position of virtually sole outside support of the Government of Laos. A substantial reduction in the cost of Laotian policy has already been achieved by the withdrawal of the military aid mission. Aid going to Laos, moreover, has been reduced from a peak annual level of \$73 million in 1962 to the present level of about \$40 million.

While this reduction has been taking place, both France and Britain have agreed

¹In that year, the U.S. mission in Saigon was accredited for all three Indochinese states—Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos—and the U.S. Minister in Saigon paid only occasional visits to what was then a small legation in Vientiane.

to share in new programs of economic reconstruction and development. So far, however, the French have been reluctant to assume any increase in responsibilities for military aid although France is the only power permitted by the Geneva accords to maintain military personnel in Laos.

The Soviet Union is also providing economic assistance to the provisional government, largely through a new commercial payments agreement. The Russians have also given Laos 10 aircraft for transport purposes. They have offered to build a hospital and a radio station and to provide credit for the construction of a large hydroelectric station.²

Concluding comments

Solution to the Laotian problem along the lines of international neutralization and national unification would be immensely difficult to achieve in the best of circumstances. Geographic and cultural factors in the situation are such as to encourage internal political fragmentation, and the sense of Laotian nationality is not widely developed among the populace. At the same time, ideological and predatory forces from without have historically tended to press in, as wedges, upon the region in which the little kingdom is located. To these obvious difficulties must be added lingering personal suspicions among the principal Laotian leaders, growing out of the experiences of the past.

What the outcome of the attempted solution will be is still very uncertain. Much hinges on the perseverance of Prince Souvanna Phouma, who as Prime Minister, has undertaken the principal responsibility. Alone among the present leaders he enjoys a stature which is larger than any faction. Much depends, too, on the willingness of France to play a significant part in providing disinterested assistance along with other outside nations. The tenuous peace, moreover, can be jeopardized if there is continued use of the facility which Laos offers for the transshipment of supplies from North Vietnam to the guerrillas in the south.

At this point, a half year after the conclusion of the agreement, it must be counted an achievement that the military conflict remains substantially in abeyance. There have been, as noted, sporadic and isolated outbreaks of hostility. In general, however, the cease-fire has held. Moreover, major outside powers—notably the United States and the Soviet Union—have been giving substantial constructive aid to the provisional government of Prime Minister Souvanna Phouma.

On the other and until the removal of all foreign forces from Laos is ascertained, until the authority of the unified government is generally accepted throughout the country, until the military forces are reduced and unified, the situation is bound to continue to hang in precarious balance. Attempts by either an outside nation or a faction within Laos to take advantage of the delicate transition could readily upset the situation, and might well bring about the abandonment of the effort at unification by Souvanna Phouma.

From the point of view of the United States, the situation is improved over that which prevailed when the Geneva Conference convened in 1961. At that time it was evident that only military intervention by SEATO, and primarily by U.S. military forces in considerable strength, in a war of uncertain depth and duration, offered the hope of preventing further deterioration in the posi-

tion of the Vientiane Government.³ The Geneva Conference interposed a cease-fire at that point, and the accords to which it led helped to forestall a deepening of U.S. involvement. At least the prospect now exists for a peaceful solution and that alone has already permitted a reduction in both aid costs and numbers of U.S. personnel in Laos.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE TO MEET DURING SENATE SESSION

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Public Roads of the Committee on Public Works was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

AMENDMENTS TO REQUEST FOR APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1966, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, CORPS OF ENGINEERS, CIVIL (S. DOC. NO. 48)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the request for appropriations for the fiscal year 1966 in the amount of \$1,311,000 for the Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers, Civil, which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

H.R. 89. An act to authorize establishment of the Delaware Valley National Recreation Area, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 598).

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY, INDIVIDUAL, AND ADDITIONAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 599)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, and also an outstanding member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I submit a report on the bill (H.R. 8283) to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, with an amendment, and I submit a report thereon. I ask

³ Indications, at the time, were that only Thailand was prepared to use troops in significant numbers. The Philippines and other non-Asian members also offered small contingents. The forces of both Thailand and the Philippines, in any event, are heavily dependent on U.S. aid.

unanimous consent that the report, together with the minority views of Senators DOMINICK, MURPHY, and FANNIN, the individual views of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the additional views of Senators JAVITS, PROUTY, DOMINICK, MURPHY, and FANNIN, be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Montana.

BILL INTRODUCED

A bill was introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. HARRIS) (by request):

S. 2408. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Otoe and Missouri Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONRONEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

DISPOSITION OF FUNDS TO PAY A JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF THE OTOE AND MISSOURIA TRIBE OF INDIANS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, at the request of the Secretary of the Interior, and for myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], I introduce a bill to provide for the distribution of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Otoe and Missouri Tribes of Indians and for other purposes, and I ask that it be appropriately referred.

I also ask to have printed in the Record at this point a statement showing the judgment funds as of March 1, 1965, a copy of a letter from the Department of the Interior, and a copy of the proposed bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and statement will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2408) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Otoe and Missouri Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. HARRIS), by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2408

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the unexpended balance of funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Otoe and Missouri Tribe of Indians that were appropriated by the Act of June 9, 1964, to pay a judgment by the Indian Claims Commission in docket No. 11-A, and the interest thereon, less payment of attorney fees and expenses, may be advanced or expended for any purpose that is authorized by the tribal governing body and approved by the

² Other bloc countries and Communist China have also indicated interest in supplying aid. Gen. Phoumi Nosavan has visited Moscow and Peiping on an economic aid mission, and a state visit by the King to the Soviet Union, the United States, and other Geneva participants is in progress.

Secretary of the Interior. Any part of such funds that may be distributed to the members of the tribe shall not be subject to Federal or State income taxes. The sum of \$150,000, and any accrued interest, shall be held in the United States Treasury pending final determination of the Yankton Sioux claim in docket No. 332-A. Any portion of such sum that is determined to belong to the Otoe and Missouri Tribe shall thereupon become subject to the foregoing provisions of this Act.

The letter and statement presented by Mr. MONRONEY are as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., August 7, 1965.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill "to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Otoe and Missouri Tribe of Indians, and for other purposes."

We recommend that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and that it be enacted.

Funds were appropriated by the act of June 9, 1964, to cover the sum of \$1,750,000 awarded the Otoe and Missouri Tribe of Indians in settlement of a judgment of the Indian Claims Commission in docket No. 11-A for inadequate compensation for lands in western Iowa and northwestern Missouri, and for valuable resources acquired by the United States from said tribe by the treaties of October 15, 1836 (7 Stat. 524), and March 15, 1854 (10 Stat. 1038). The judgment funds are credited to the account of this tribe and draw interest at 4 percent per annum. However, the sum of \$1,750,000 is subject to a proviso that \$150,000 will be withheld from disbursement until there is a final determination of the conflicting claim of the Yankton Sioux Tribe, the petitioner in docket No. 332-A.

The Otoe and Missouri Reservation is located in the northeastern part of Noble County, Okla., and contains 1,400 acres of tribal land and 33,437 acres of allotted land. It is reported that 512 tribal members live within the reservation area and 461 adjacent to it.

The Otoe and Missouri tribal membership roll has not been updated, but the tribe does have membership criteria which were approved by this Department on June 10, 1949. In 1954, total enrollment was reported to be 1,042.

A previous judgment award in docket No. 11 was distributed to descendants of Otoe and Missouri Indians under the provisions of the act of May 9, 1958 (72 Stat. 105). These descendants included a large number of persons who were not entitled to enrollment with the Otoe and Missouri Tribe. However, the proposed bill provides for the present Otoe and Missouri tribal governing body to administer the funds subject to the approval of the Secretary, the present tribe being regarded as the successor in interest to the parent group of 1836 and 1854. Consequently, if a per capita payment is made only duly enrolled members of the present Otoe and Missouri Tribe will participate in the distribution.

The Otoe and Missouri Tribe has a recognized governing body consisting of a general council and a business committee. This Department has recognized the Otoe and Missouri tribal organization, although the group has not yet developed a formal organizational document. Formal organization is under active consideration by the group and it is therefore possible that a tribal constitution will be developed and approved prior to the actual programming of the funds. This group has considered vari-

ous socioeconomic developmental projects. None of them, however, have as yet been formally proposed.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this bill from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY R. ANDERSON,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Otoe and Missouri Tribe (Docket No. 11-A)
judgment funds—balance as of Mar. 1,
1965

14X7065—Awards of Indian Claims Commission, Otoe and Missouri Tribe of Indians.....	\$1,750,000.00
Less Attorneys fees paid.....	160,000.00
Less Attorneys expenses.....	6,090.59

Balance.....	1,583,909.41
Less amount to be withheld, together with interest thereon, from disbursement until a final determination is entered in docket No. 332-A regarding a conflicting claim of the Yankton Sioux Tribe.....	150,000.00
Less amount to be withheld from disbursement as attorney fees pending the final determination of the conflicting claim of the Yankton Sioux Tribe, petitioner in docket No. 332-A.....	15,000.00

14X7565—Interest and accruals on interest, Awards Indian Claims Commission, Otoe and Missouri Tribe of Indians (through March 1, 1965).....	132,534.43
Balance available.....	1,451,443.84

¹ If the claim of the Yankton Sioux Tribe in docket No. 332-A is allowed, this amount will be decreased by the amount of interest accrued on the \$150,000.00 presently being withheld pending final settlement of docket No. 332-A.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 386 AND 387

Mr. JAVITS submitted two amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 8283) to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AUTHORITY FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORT DURING ADJOURNMENT—SUPPLEMENTAL AND MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate the Committee on the District of Columbia be permitted to file a report on the bill (H.R. 5688) relating to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia. I also ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with supplemental and minority views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] be added as a cosponsor to Senate bill 1676, to provide for certain reorganizations in the Department of State and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1951, AS AMENDED

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 573, H.R. 10306.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10306) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1951, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate Committee on Armed Services unanimously reported Senate bill 2381. H.R. 10306 is identical with S. 2381, as amended. Since the bills are identical, I should like to make a statement on the pending bill.

The bill amends the Universal Military Training and Service Act, which appears in the appendix to title 50 of the United States Code, to include a clear statutory prohibition against any person knowingly destroying or knowingly mutilating a draft card. The existing law already provides prohibition against the altering of a draft card as well as a number of offenses connected with the selective service registration, but there now is no specific prohibition against the willful destruction or mutilation of a draft card.

Recent incidents of mass destruction of draft cards constitute open defiance of the warmaking powers of the Government and have demonstrated an urgent need for this legislation.

The criminal prohibitions instituted by this bill would be limited to willful incidents. The prohibition would not apply to instances where draft cards were destroyed or mutilated by inadvertence.

The President has acknowledged that our country is engaged in a war. Attempts to interfere with the Universal Military Training Act or service in the Armed Forces constitute treason in time of war. Such conduct as public burnings of draft cards and public pleas for persons to refuse to register for their draft should not and must not be tolerated by a society whose sons, brothers, and husbands are giving their lives in defense of freedom and countrymen against Communist aggression.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no

amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 10306) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to postpone indefinitely further consideration of Senate bill 2381.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 8283.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 8283) to expand the war on poverty and to enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I send to the desk certain amendments to the bill and ask that under the rule they be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be printed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this afternoon, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT ON THE MISSILE SILO DISASTER IN ARKANSAS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the text of Secretary Zuckert's report to the President upon our inspection trip to Searcy.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT FROM AIR FORCE SECRETARY EUGENE M. ZUCKERT

Yesterday, as you requested, I went to Searcy, Ark., to inspect the site of the Titan II missile silo disaster. I was accompanied by Senators McCLELLAN and FULBRIGHT and Congressman MILLS. We were met in Little Rock by Governor Faubus and the mayor of Little Rock, as well as by the representative of the mayor of North Little Rock.

The purpose of my visit was threefold: first, to express on your behalf and for the Air Force, our concern and deep feeling of sympathy for those who have lost loved ones in this tragic disaster; second, to insure that the investigation which is being conducted by the Air Force Inspector General's office under Brig. Gen. Charles B. Stewart will be thorough, critically objective, and that it will be completed without delay; and third, to ascertain personally that all possible aid and assistance is being afforded the survivors and relatives of the men who lost their lives in the disaster. I believe I can assure you, and Governor Faubus confirmed this in my conversation with him, that your wish to provide all possible assistance to the victims' families is being completely carried out.

General Stewart's investigation, while progressing on a round-the-clock basis, is still in the preliminary stage. Investigative experts, of many categories, from the Air Force and industry are being utilized, and, to the extent necessary, additional experts will be called in.

It should be noted at the outset that the accident took place under conditions and circumstances far different from normal operations and maintenance requirements. When the missile is on alert and undergoing normal maintenance, only a few men, usually 10 or less, would be engaged in work in the missile area.

This project required a large number of contractor personnel to be in the missile silo at one time. It was apparent to all of us visiting the silo that this is an inherently difficult situation for a large scale maintenance or modification effort. There are difficulties involved in a project of this type where a large number of men with their necessary construction equipment are required to work on the various levels of the missile silo in a confined and congested space already densely packed with the equipment.

A personal examination of the silo revealed that the fire damage was limited to a small area near the electrical control panels and the motor control center, resulting in a complete loss of lights and electrical power.

The cause of death was almost exclusively asphyxiation. A number of men had attempted to escape by the emergency ladder which apparently was blocked by two men who became jammed together in trying to pass simultaneously through a restricted area on the ladder, thus denying access to those on the ladder below them.

It is apparent that the investigators must examine the adequacy of the escape system and emergency equipment, the training and discipline of contractor personnel, and the emergency lighting and escape equipment during periods of unusually heavy maintenance or modification.

It is significant to note that 21 identical facilities have been modified by the same contractor. In some 206 days of work on this contract there had been no lost time injuries. The modification of the remaining 33 Titan sites has been suspended until the report of the investigating team is complete and the corrective action indicated by the investigators has been taken.

A BRIGHTER OUTLOOK FOR USIA

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as the author of Public Law 402 of the 80th Congress which set up the legislative authority for the operation of our U.S. foreign information programs, as well as our exchange of leaders and peoples programs, and other media for presenting the truth about our country to people in foreign lands, I have always maintained a more than normal interest in the actual operations of these programs. It is for that reason that I have observed with pleasure the appointment of Leonard Marks as the new Director of the USIA and his announcement that he has selected Howard L. Chernoff of San Diego as his primary assistant.

I have long known both Mr. Marks and Mr. Chernoff, Mr. President. I regard them highly. It is true that they are new to the field of activities they will soon direct, but it occurs to me that there are many indications that these programs should be given a new look and a new approach. By proceeding positively and by being free to make the changes necessary, it is hoped and believed that these two able new leaders will greatly enhance the product and the productivity of USIA. I wish them well and have assured them both of my earnest cooperation in their new responsibilities.

Mr. President, I am happy to ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a recent editorial in the daily Argus-Leader of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., endorsing these selections and appointments. The writer of this editorial knows both Mr. Marks and Mr. Chernoff personally and shares my high regard for them. His evaluation of their abilities is important and I want to have the Congress and the country share the observations of this important Midwestern newspaper.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus-Leader, Aug. 5, 1965]

A BRIGHTER OUTLOOK FOR USIA

The U.S. Information Agency is among our Government's most important facilities. In truth, the future course of events may depend to a material extent upon how well this agency projects our image throughout the world.

Unfortunately, the current image of the United States in many nations is a distortion—a distortion aided and abetted by instrumentalities of other countries eager to misrepresent our country.

And these hostile influences have been more potent for a number of years than our USIA. That may be due to circumstances beyond the control of our agency. But it may be due to a considerable extent to the fact that the USIA hasn't measured up to its possibilities and its opportunities.

Now a change has been made in the leadership of the USIA with the appointment of Leonard Marks, of Washington, as its director. He is a man who has been prominent in the communications field and there is good reason to believe that he can make the USIA a more useful institution.

One reason for confidence in his leadership is the good judgment he employed this week in selecting Howard L. Chernoff of San Diego as his primary assistant. Chernoff is

capable, energetic and knows how to get things done.

Chernoff's good qualities are, of course, well known to many in Sioux Falls because of his experience here as associate publisher of the *Argus-Leader* while John A. Kennedy was publisher and editor in chief. During that period he took a lively and productive interest in many local and State activities. A primary project instigated by him, for example, was the Great Plains Zoo—now a fine and splendid institution of which the entire community is proud. The quiet but effective way in which he developed it serves as an indication of what he can do.

It is entirely likely that the new leadership of the USIA will result in a fresh approach to its duties. One trouble in the past has been that the agency didn't seem to know precisely what it was doing or what it should do.

Marks and Chernoff, we are certain, will go forward in the realization that its duty is, so to speak, to "accentuate the positive" and present a report to the world of what is good about the United States. This doesn't mean distortion in any sense because our Nation is basically good and its purpose in world affairs is to promote that which is worthwhile. Certainly we have no territorial designs on other areas and no desire to impose our own ideas of government. We are eager to be a good neighbor and this impression should be adequately presented around the world. We like to believe that Marks and Chernoff can do it.

ANCHORAGE "ALL AMERICAN CITY," CONTINUES TO LIVE UP TO ITS DESIGNATION AS IT FORGES AHEAD

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the city of Anchorage, Alaska, some years ago was honored with the designation of "All American City." While I do not feel this recognition was premature, the strides which Anchorage has made in the past few years, particularly since the shattering earthquake of March 27, 1964, have been such that this remarkable city deserves new recognition and honors.

I must confess that when I walked the crevassed and debris-littered streets of Anchorage the day after the Good Friday earthquake, I certainly did not foresee anything like the reconstruction and construction which have taken place in this largest of Alaska's communities in the 17 months which have now passed.

One of the most heavily damaged buildings in Anchorage was the department store of the J. C. Penney Co. It had been completed only a few months earlier. The earthquake damaged this new building so severely that wreckers had to complete the destruction which was started by the earthquake and level the site. I am happy to report that a new, larger, and better store will be opened by the J. C. Penney Co. at Anchorage on September 1. While this is not the largest department store in the company's complex, I understand it is the largest store ever built by Penney prior to its opening. The other stores which are larger have been made so by additions following the original construction. This evidence of faith by the national business community is heartening.

While the Penney building, because of the spectacular damage done to the ear-

lier building, represents a fitting symbol of the renaissance of Anchorage, it is only one of the many impressive new structures which have risen in the city in the past year; others include, notably, the new Captain Cook Hotel, the First National Bank Building, and the building of Alaska Sales & Service. Together, these structures represent probably \$30 million in private comeback capital.

Long ago I ceased to permit myself to be amazed by the progress in Anchorage. It is an exciting place which keeps growing despite all problems and obstacles. The people of Anchorage deserve unbounded credit for their progressiveness, energy, diligence, and faith.

I am happy to be able to salute the wonderful city of Anchorage.

INVASION OF STATES RIGHTS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, several days ago the *Cleveland Plain Dealer* carried an editorial under the title "New Attack on States' Powers," which I believe is worthy of consideration by Members of the Senate.

The editorial opposes the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, primarily on the basis that the repeal of the section would constitute an unwarranted invasion of States rights.

The editorial makes mention of the tremendous growth of the Central Government in Washington. It expresses the view that this is one field of activity in which the States definitely ought to have the right to determine for themselves what course they wish to follow on the issue of right-to-work. There is great strength in what the editorial has to say.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the *Record* at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

[From the *Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer*, Aug. 4, 1965]

NEW ATTACK ON STATES' POWERS

The U.S. Senate should refuse to follow the lead of the House of Representatives in voting to take away from States the power to have right-to-work laws.

Ohioans made clear in 1958, by a 2 to 1 statewide vote, that they did not want such a law in this State. The *Plain Dealer* believes that this judgment by the voters of Ohio should stand.

But in 19 other States the people or their elected Representatives decided in favor of statutes or constitutional provisions outlawing the union shop.

For Congress to deny these States the power to have such laws is an unjustifiable intrusion by the Federal Government and a serious abridgement of States rights.

The growth of centralized government in Washington is a fact of life. In most instances this growth has been a necessity because of the increasing complexities of life in this automated age and the interdependence of people. But wherever possible—and this area of right-to-work laws is certainly one place—the States should retain as much independent authority as possible.

The manner in which H.R. 77 to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947 was railroaded through to passage by the

narrow margin of 221 to 203 on the House floor also argues against it.

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, invoked a rule that prohibited floor consideration of any amendment except one that would have changed the effective date of the repealer.

President Johnson, whose own home State of Texas has a right-to-law law, wants the repealer. Congress has had difficulty in saying no to anything the President has sought, but this time the Senate should do so.

This is not a question of whether right-to-work laws are good or bad. It is a question of how far the Federal Government should go in reducing the powers of the State. In the case of section 14(b), the Senate stands as the last possible protector of these powers.

REPLY TO THE ALABAMA LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on July 15, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] inserted into the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* various reports of the Alabama Legislative Commission To Preserve the Peace. One of these reports made certain allegations regarding the League for Industrial Democracy, which is located in my State and city at 112 East 19th Street, New York, N.Y.

The League for Industrial Democracy, through its chairman of the board, Michael Harrington, has requested me to submit a statement prepared by the league's executive secretary in reply to these allegations; and in order for the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*, which already contains the charges, to contain also the reply from the league—as is the practice of many of the committees of the Congress—I ask unanimous consent that the statement by the League for Industrial Democracy be inserted in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

(NOTE.—The following statement was prepared by Tom Kahn, executive secretary of the League for Industrial Democracy, in reply to certain allegations by the Alabama Legislative Commission To Preserve the Peace. These allegations, inserted into the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* of July 15, 1965, by Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, sought to link the LID with organizations and/or activities which are "Communist dominated." All or part of this statement may be quoted.)

Senator STROM THURMOND has inserted into the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* of July 15, 1965, various findings of the Alabama Legislative Commission To Preserve the Peace. Among these findings are false and damaging allegations about the League for Industrial Democracy, a tax-exempt educational organization now in its 60th year of education for increasing democracy in our economic, political, and cultural life.

Since its founding by Upton Sinclair, Jack London, and Clarence Darrow, the league has been unalterably opposed to totalitarianism of the left and the right. While the league grows out of the tradition of democratic socialism, it cannot be described as a "radical Socialist group," for its members include many trade unionists, civil rights activists, and academicians with no adherence to Socialist doctrines.

Until his death, John Dewey was for many years the honorary president of the league, after retiring as active president; among its most prominent leaders are such people as: Norman Thomas, Harold Taylor, Rev. Donald Harrington, Sidney Hook, Victor Reuther, Frank P. Graham, Albert Sprague Coolidge, and Bayard Rustin. Its chairman is Michael Harrington, author of "The Other America," the important book which helped awaken the Nation's conscience to poverty in America.

One may or may not agree with the views of these individuals or of other members of the league, but to link them with communism, which they strongly oppose, is unfair. If liberal and democratic socialist ideas are to be equated with communism, there can be no free and intelligent debate.

The Alabama commission charges that the League for Industrial Democracy "occupies joint offices with SDS, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York City, and also with SNCC, at the same address." The fact is that the LID has never had offices at that address but has been located for nearly 40 years at 112 East 19th Street, New York City. Nor has SDS ever occupied offices at the address cited; it was located at 112 East 19th Street until March 1964, when it moved to 119 Fifth Avenue where it remained until June of this year when its national offices were moved to Chicago. SDS therefore could not have shared offices with SNCC, which was located at 156 Fifth Avenue—in space made available to it by the American Civil Liberties Union. It might be added that the building at 156 Fifth Avenue houses numerous organizations of various persuasion which could not possibly be interconnected by virtue of their street address.

If the Alabama commission is unable accurately to report the LID's address, which should be easy enough to ascertain, one wonders about its ability to describe the organization's views and activities.

Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) is the student department of the LID and is subsidized by it. Contrary to the commission's findings, however, the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) has no formal ties with the LID, nor is it in any way subsidized by the league. In making this clear, the league is not accepting the validity of the commission's charges that SNCC is "extensively Communist dominated," a charge which segregationists are using to smear the civil rights movement.

The Alabama commission states that the league is "financially supported by the millionaire financier of Communist causes, Corliss Lamont." This is a misleading statement. The league's records show that Mr. Lamont did indeed make contributions to the organization—but decades ago and in sums averaging \$10–\$15 a year. His last contribution of \$10 was received in 1938. These facts hardly sustain the implication that Mr. Lamont was a significant or even notable source of financial support for the league, let alone that the league endorses his views, past or present.

Finally, the commission asserts that: "The SNCC buttons and a special button 'I support MFDP' (Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party) were ordered and delivered from the Olympic Button and Emblem Co., New York, N.Y., and the bill for these was paid by LID."

The fact is that no such buttons were ordered or paid for by the LID, or for that matter by its student department. Nor is the league able to ascertain how the commission might have arrived at this finding, in the absence of any evidence to support it.

It is bad enough that an official State body such as the Alabama Legislative Commission to Preserve the Peace, financed by taxpayer's money, can be utilized as a partisan

instrument to defame and cast aspersions on the integrity and reputation of private organizations with which it does not agree. It is even more distressing that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which present and future generations of Americans should be able to regard as a source of accurate information, can be used as a repository for false and damaging characterizations of organizations like the League for Industrial Democracy.

THE FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BERLIN WALL, AUGUST 13, 1965

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, today is the anniversary of the construction of the Berlin wall. It was 4 years ago today that the Communist empire had to make the humiliating admission that its subjects were not loyal to the tyrannies of the Ulbrecht regime. In the time that has elapsed, the wall has become the symbol of oppression, the scene of riots and demonstrations; and the cause for the murder of 146 brave East Germans willing to risk all in their last-ditch attempts to escape into freedom. Recently, the Communists have had to compound their admission of failure by extending the wall underground to prevent escapes.

The words of President Kennedy, "Ich bin ein Berliner," live immortally in the hearts of West Germans. These words express the sentiment of most Americans, who in the past 20 years have invested so much money, energy, and blood in West Berlin to keep it free. The wall stands to show all free people that such investments made in the interest of liberty are not in vain.

There is today a most marked contrast between the two sectors of the city. While the economy of West Berlin is burgeoning at a fantastic pace, that of East Berlin crawls along. As the West Berliner becomes ever more prosperous, the average East Berliner continues to live at a near subsistence level.

The wall cannot make people on either side blind to these differences between them. It serves only to show the world in a most blatant fashion which ideology Berliners prefer. Four years ago today even the Communist bloc was forced to admit that Berliners consider the democratic way of life the preferable way of life.

APPOINTMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE OREN HARRIS AS U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senate upon its prompt and unanimous confirmation, on August 11, of my friend and colleague Representative OREN HARRIS, for the position of U.S. district judge for the eastern and western districts of Arkansas.

I was absent from the Senate at that time because of my participation in an official on-the-scene inspection of the tragic fire which occurred at an Air Force missile installation near Searcy, Ark.

Our State and the House of Representatives have lost an able and effective legislator, but I am confident that

Representative OREN HARRIS will be an equally able and effective Federal judge.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the RECORD the text of my statement to the Senate Judiciary Committee and the text of an editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on August 10, 1965.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I deeply regret that I cannot be present to support the nomination of my colleague, the Honorable OREN HARRIS, who has been nominated by the President to be Federal district judge in my State. As I remarked to the press upon learning of this nomination, I am pleased that the President has nominated Congressman HARRIS to be a Federal judge. My feelings are mixed, however, for I regret that the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Arkansas, and the entire Nation will no longer have the benefit of his able services in the House of Representatives.

I have served in the Congress with OREN HARRIS for over 20 years, and I personally shall miss our association and his wise counsel.

The Congress of the United States will be poorer upon his departure, but the Federal judiciary will be enhanced.

I am confident that OREN HARRIS will be as outstanding a Federal judge as he has been a Member of the Congress.

OREN HARRIS is eminently qualified to assume this position in our Federal judicial system. Following his graduation from Cumberland Law School with an LL.B. degree, he assumed the practice of law in 1930. He has served honorably and capably as a deputy prosecuting attorney and as a prosecuting attorney of his home judicial circuit. Not only has OREN HARRIS engaged in the practice of law, but he has been engaged in the formulation of a large and important segment of our body of laws since 1940. So, he has not only been an able practitioner of his profession but has been one of the Nation's foremost legislators.

As chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives, he has presided with great ability and great wisdom, and with judicious exercise of the duties incumbent, incident to his position as chairman of a great committee of the Congress.

So, Mr. Chairman, while I cannot appear in person to urge approval of this nomination, I nevertheless endorse it wholeheartedly and strongly urge the committee to act favorably on it.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Aug. 10, 1965]

NEW CAREER FOR REPRESENTATIVE HARRIS

The Presidential nomination of Representative OREN HARRIS for a Federal judgeship will remove from Washington a veteran lawmaker who, for all his easygoing southern manner, has served as a remarkably able gadfly in several important investigations.

The chairman of the parent House Commerce Committee, Mr. HARRIS also has helped enhance his national image as chairman of a smaller unit once known by the somewhat curious title of the Special Subcommittee on Legislative Oversight.

Mr. HARRIS has brought discomfort and reform to the Nation's disc jockeys, defining the word "payola" for future dictionaries. Under his owlish stare, the rating services wriggled uncomfortably and the broadcasting industry promised better self-regulation.

The Government regulatory agencies, often accused of promoting the industries they are

supposed to control, felt the HARRIS treatment more than once. After his baleful attention to their outside activities, both John C. Doerfer and the late Richard A. Mack resigned from the Federal Communications Commission.

Posterity probably will remember Mr. HARRIS best, however, for the Goldfine case and that dramatic confrontation with Sherman Adams, chief White House assistant, which ultimately led to Mr. Adams' resignation too.

The result of these and other revelations was a document known as Public Law 87-849, enacted in 1962, spelling out a broad new code of ethics for Federal employees covering conflict of interest. As one who helped set the stage for this development, Mr. HARRIS served the national conscience well.

FIRST CONGRESS OF MICRONESIA EXPRESSES APPRECIATION TO HAWAII TEAM

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, it is a matter of deep satisfaction that Hawaii was able to contribute substantially to the success of the just-adjourned Congress of Micronesia in Saipan, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. This was a historic first session of the Congress of Micronesia—the first territorywide, democratically elected legislative body representing the 87,000 people of the trust territory.

Prior to the convening of the Congress of Micronesia on July 12, 1965, a legislative workshop for the members of the Congress was conducted through arrangements made by Dr. Y. Baron Goto, vice chancellor of the East-West Center, Institute for Technical Interchange, in Honolulu, Hawaii.

The team was comprised of Dr. Goto; Dr. Norman Meller, professor of political science, University of Hawaii; Mr. Thomas Dinell, director-researcher of the university's legislative reference bureau, and Mr. Thomas P. Gill, director of the Hawaii State Office of Economic Opportunity.

Dr. Goto and his associates from Hawaii participated in the workshop and assisted the members on parliamentary procedures, organizational matters, and related subjects.

It is gratifying to learn that the first joint resolution adopted by the two-house Congress was to express the appreciation and gratitude of the Micronesian Congress to the team from Hawaii.

This was another example of the numerous ways in which the people of Hawaii have been extending a helping hand to their fellow Pacific islanders in the trust territory. Such assistance is materially contributing to the ability of the United States in carrying out its responsibility, under its trust agreement with the United Nations Security Council toward promoting greater self-government for the people of the trust territory. It is another compelling reason why the proposal for annexing the trust territory to the State of Hawaii appears to me to be both logical and reasonable.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of the joint resolution adopted by the first session of the Congress of Micronesia.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

J.R. 1

House joint resolution expressing appreciation and gratitude of the Congress of Micronesia to Dr. Y. Baron Goto, vice chancellor, East-West Center, Institute for Cultural Interchange; Dr. Norman Meller, professor of political science, University of Hawaii; Mr. Thomas Dinell, director-researcher, legislative reference bureau, University of Hawaii; Mr. Thomas P. Gill, director of economic opportunity, State of Hawaii

Whereas through the effort of Dr. Y. Baron Goto, vice chancellor of the East-West Center, Institute for Cultural Interchange, a pre-session legislative workshop for the members of the Congress of Micronesia, was made possible; and

Whereas Dr. Norman Meller, professor of political science; Mr. Thomas Dinell, director-researcher of the legislative reference bureau, and Mr. Thomas P. Gill, director of economic opportunity for the State of Hawaii conducted such legislative workshop with diligence, dedication and preservation; and

Whereas the members of the Congress of Micronesia were greatly benefited from such training which will enable the members to grasp the intricacies of legislative processes; and

Whereas in this historic first session of the Congress of Micronesia, where for the first time in the history of this territory, representatives met in a duly constituted legislative body, it is essential that the members have a general awareness of the nature and works of a legislative forum; and

Whereas the members of the Congress of Micronesia are appreciative of the services of the governmental experts from the East-West Center, and are desirous of expressing their gratitude to the training group: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of delegates, general session of 1965 (the general assembly concurring), That the Congress of Micronesia does hereby, by virtue of this joint resolution, extend its gratitude and appreciation to the East-West Center, University of Hawaii, and to Dr. Y. Baron Goto, vice chancellor of the East-West Center, Institute for Cultural Interchange, to Dr. Norman Meller, professor of political science, University of Hawaii, to Mr. Thomas Dinell, director-researcher, legislative reference bureau, University of Hawaii and to Mr. Thomas P. Gill, director of economic opportunity, State of Hawaii; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this joint resolution be hereby transmitted to the Secretary of Interior; Governor, State of Hawaii; president, University of Hawaii; chancellor, East-West Center, and the high commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this joint resolution be hereby transmitted to Dr. Y. Baron Goto, vice chancellor of East-West Center, Institute for Cultural Interchange, Dr. Norman Meller, professor of political science, University of Hawaii, Mr. Thomas P. Gill, director of economic opportunity, State of Hawaii; Mr. Thomas Dinell, director-researcher, legislative reference bureau, University of Hawaii.

OLYMPIO T. BORJA,
JOSE R. CRUZ.

JULY 15, 1965.

LAWLESSNESS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, there appeared in Thursday's edition of the

Washington Evening Star an excellent editorial concerning the national crime problem, particularly the high rate of lawlessness in the District of Columbia, which quite properly places a portion of the responsibility at the feet of many of our courts.

It has been my view for some time that many of our courts have been more concerned with the rights of criminals than with the rights and safety of law-abiding citizens. Consequently, law enforcement in recent years has suffered one setback after another at the hands of courts which have become so obsessed with technicalities that murderers, thieves, and rapists are often turned loose upon society. It is high time that the American people demanded that their courts concern themselves more with the administration of justice than with legal abstractions.

I call this editorial, which sets a very good case in point, to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Aug. 12, 1965]

CONCERN FOR THE PUBLIC

Lewis F. Powell, Jr. told some 3,000 delegates to the American Bar Association meeting in Miami that the rising crime rate is this Nation's No. 1 domestic problem. And, while commending the growth of concern for the constitutional rights of defendants, he demanded as a first priority "a like concern for the right of the citizen to be free from criminal molestation in his person and property."

This expression was roundly applauded by the delegates. The lamentable fact is, however, that so far as most of the appellate judges are concerned, their regard for the rights of a defendant is accompanied by no apparent similar regard for the rights of citizens.

A recent case in point is that of Thomas H. Washington, who is finally in jail after arrests in connection with three rapes in less than a year in this city.

In the first case the victim committed suicide shortly before facing the ordeal of the trial, and the charge had to be dropped. In the second case the evidence pointing to Washington's guilt was suppressed by Trial Judge George L. Hart, Jr. because of doubt as to the lawfulness of its seizure. Judge Hart said he did this most reluctantly, which undoubtedly was the case, but he added that he felt compelled to do so under the extreme technical rules laid down by our U.S. Court of Appeals. In any event it became necessary once again to release Washington even though the judge said he was fearful that he was making possible the rape of another innocent District resident.

He was a better prophet than he knew. For within a few weeks Washington grabbed another woman walking on the street, cut her arm and dragged her into a garage, where he was caught in the act of raping her. This time he was refused bond and committed to jail pending indictment and trial. It seems unlikely that technicalities can save him again. At least, we hope not.

In discussing his action in the Washington case, Judge Hart made a comment similar to Mr. Powell's, and, it might be added, a trial judge operating under the restraints imposed in this city is in an especially good position to know what he is talking about.

"Much has been said," he observed, "about protecting the rights of persons of deprived backgrounds who are accused of crime. It is time we consider protecting the rights of people such as Washington's latest victim, who was equally deprived."

We couldn't be in more complete agreement, and we are a bit puzzled by a statement reportedly made to the ABA by Deputy Attorney General Ramsey Clark. He decried criticism of the courts, although why the judges should be insulated from criticism is beyond our understanding, and he also said that "court rules do not cause crime." What explanation, we wonder, does the Deputy Attorney General have to offer for the continuing rise in crime, and especially the 19.5 percent increase in Washington last month? Could it be the barriers to convictions?

SENATOR ROBERT BYRD'S ENLIGHTENED STAND ON BIRTH CONTROL

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, sound commonsense and realistic appraisal of an overshadowing issue was voiced by our able and distinguished colleague from West Virginia, ROBERT C. BYRD, reported in a dispatch from Washington to the Charleston, W. Va., Gazette by Harry Ernst, this paper's Washington correspondent. Senator BYRD urges that birth control services be rendered to the poor if the war on poverty is to be successful in his State.

Speaking in support of President Johnson's proposal in his state of the Union message, to "seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population and the growing scarcity in world resources," Senator BYRD points out:

Despite the considerable changes in climate surrounding the issue of birth control during the past few years, public officials are still hesitant to take the needed action.

He is quite correct in this. It is remarkable how rapidly the climate has changed and is continuing to change.

Mr. President, for the past 2 months the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures of the Committee on Government Operations, of which I am chairman, has been conducting hearings on this vital issue. It is impressive to see the earnestness and seriousness of the testimony presented by outstanding witnesses, indicating both the urgency and the progress that has been made in meeting this issue.

I highly commend Senator BYRD for his forthright discussion of this issue and ask unanimous consent that the article from the August 4 issue of the Charleston Gazette headed "Birth Control Urged by BYRD" be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN POVERTY WAR: BIRTH CONTROL URGED BY BYRD

(By Harry Ernst)

WASHINGTON.—The war on poverty must offer birth control services to the poor if it is to be victorious in West Virginia and the Nation, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, Democrat of West Virginia, said Tuesday.

"If it is going to leave any longrun solution as a legacy to future generations, it

should deal boldly with problems of family planning," he commented in an interview.

"I don't think the Federal Government has exhibited the kind of bold, forthright, and aggressive leadership needed in dealing with family planning."

Senator BYRD is the first prominent West Virginia politician to strongly urge offering Government-financed birth control services to the poor including unwed mothers.

"I think it's about time we stopped slipping this problem under the rug and began doing something about it," he said. "There is no point hacking at the fringes of poverty. Let's go to the roots of it."

BYRD said birth control services should be offered to anyone who is interested, especially unwed mothers who should be given information as well as free contraceptives.

"This problem (lack of birth control services) is so far reaching and broad that it is almost criminal to overlook it," he stressed. "We should do something about it now."

Earlier on the Senate floor, BYRD urged his colleagues to speak out in support of President Johnson's proposal to "seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population and the growing scarcity in world resources."

"Despite the considerable changes in climate surrounding the issues of birth control during the past few years, public officials are still hesitant to take the needed action," the West Virginia Senator said.

"There are presently a number of Federal programs under which the State may obtain aid for family planning services. But in most cases a clarification of policy is needed."

"The President has taken the first steps. But I think in view of the past history of this question it is unfair to expect him to take all the political risk, if there in fact is a risk," BYRD observed.

"Children are being born every second. Often they are unwanted. They in turn will produce more unwanted children. No war on poverty can ever be a victorious one if its wagers do not identify the real problems."

"And the problem is the spiraling birth rate among those who are incapable of adequately providing for their offspring."

BYRD said the population of the United States will jump from about 180 to 340 million in the next 35 years "at our present rate of reproduction."

"From where will the jobs come for these people," he asked. BYRD said the poor don't want to have more children than they can adequately provide for.

"What we must do is give them a choice," he commented. "Opportunities for the impoverished must include the opportunity to plan family growth."

"The hopelessness of the constant flow of children, often unwanted, to people already with little hope cannot be overestimated. And something can be done about it. The time to do it is now."

So far West Virginia's antipoverty program has received no Federal funds to provide birth control services, although the Kanawha-Charleston health department has said it would like funds for that purpose.

The U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) has provided communities with funds to establish birth control clinics that must be voluntary and include instruction in the rhythm method for Roman Catholics, whose church disapproves of contraceptives.

Senator BYRD said OEO hasn't taken a vigorous enough position on the need for extending birth control services to the poor. But he thinks the Federal Government is beginning to move in that direction.

As chairman of the District Appropriations Subcommittee, he has been instrumental in establishing federally financed birth control clinics in the District of Columbia.

SEVENTH ANNUAL LIFESAVING WEEK IN RHODE ISLAND

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, we in Rhode Island have just wound up our Seventh Annual Lifesaving week under the leadership of Capt. Roger Williams Wheeler. This has been amongst one of the State's most unusual and successful celebrations.

All kinds and sorts of contests and activities are engaged in by the various Rhode Island State lifeguards during the program. They swim, row lifesaving dories, march in a parade, and are feted at a big dinner in their honor during that time.

Rhode Island is truly an outstanding vacation land, combining recreation and the heritage of New England, of the sea, of tourism and of rest and relaxation. And at all times, during the wonderful summertime period, our residents, visitors, and vacationers of all ages are protected by our fine lifeguards, both young men and women.

They supervise the seashore and inland fresh water areas, public and private, as part of a State program with a long and fine history of excellence in the saving of lives and the prevention of accidents. They specialize in aquatic safety, and give first aid treatment to uncounted thousands. Theirs is indeed an outstanding record.

All of this week exists mainly because of the energy and originality of one man, Capt. Roger Williams Wheeler. He has given of himself to our State for more than 30 years, having started with Theodore Francis Green, then Governor, and later my predecessor in the U.S. Senate, a program of lifesaving in our State. At a great financial loss to himself and at the expenditure of his time and energy, he has taught youngsters in our State lifesaving and first aid and has been an inspiration to them all.

Captain Wheeler was born in the seaside city of Newport, my home city, with its long tradition of the Navy. From his start as a surferman at Newport Beach, he has been constantly on the water, having joined the Coast Guard in 1930. For 30 years he has been in the Rhode Island lifesaving system since its organization by him under Governor Green. In 1938 he was commodore of the U.S. Life Savings Corps, and from 1947 to now he has been commodore and superintendent of the U.S. Volunteer Life Savings Corps. He has lectured on lifesaving and first aid procedure for 31 years.

Accordingly, in behalf of so many people of our State, I take this occasion to congratulate Captain Wheeler, wish him the very best of good luck, and take the liberty of doing so on the floor of the Senate in the hope that his example may serve to inspire similar lines of activity in other States.

BRAZIL

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, having just returned from a trip to Brazil, it was with special interest that I read a clear and informative column by Marquis Childs in the Washington

Post this morning, entitled "Inflation Still Confounds Brazil."

With possibly one exception I agree fully with this penetrating analysis, and Mr. Childs could well be right about that.

That exception has to do with Jucelino Kubitschek. I found some people who thought he could make a political comeback, but others also who did not agree, believing him responsible for much of the inflation which later nearly engulfed the country.

Those of us who wish Brazil well can only hope that if Castello Branco does not continue at the helm of their Government the people of Brazil will find a comparable leader.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFLATION STILL CONFOUNDS BRAZIL

(By Marquis Childs)

BRASILIA, BRAZIL.—It has the look of a magician's fabulous trick conjured out of the dark red earth of the Planalto (high plains). Scarce waste 10 years ago, Brasilia is today a capital with perhaps the most distinguished contemporary architecture in the West, a city with its suburbs of 200,000.

What the revolutionary government of President Humberto Castello Branco is trying to do in 2½ years also partakes of something of the magical. The orgy of corruption and demagoguery under Joao Goulart had brought this nation of 84 million close to total breakdown in April 1963. Anarchy and mob rule were just ahead as the printing presses poured out money with less and less value each day.

In a characteristically bloodless Brazilian coup, the military imposed order. They chose a retired military man of unquestioned integrity to be President as Goulart fled the country. And the Congress, having gone through certain constitutional gyrations, voted Castello Branco into the office.

The President lists three goals for what he says must be his transitional service. They are, first checking the runaway inflation; second, getting production started again, and third, strengthening the democratic process in Brazil.

In the first 16 months, he is still a long way from these goals, and that is one reason the president is under increasing pressure to agree to stay on in the office—by means of another congressional vote—beyond the elections due in October 1966.

But when Castello Branco says the great danger to democracy in Latin America is personal power, he speaks not only the historic truth but with what seems every evidence of sincerity. He is pushing an electoral law that will reduce the number of parties from 13, most of them irresponsible splinters, to 4 or 5. Thereby, he hopes to cut out some of the wilder eccentricities of Brazilian politics.

If he succeeds in handing over power to a duly elected president, Castello Branco will have done what for a military man in this part of the hemisphere is like squaring the circle. Yet this short, thick set, almost shy retired field marshal, who gives careful, precise answers to political questions, seems determined to do just that. Those observing him in office believe his "no" means "no" and that he will not be persuaded to stay in power.

However bloodless, the omelet of the revolution was not made without breaking eggs. Several thousand suspected Communists or

Communist-leaning leftists were jailed or forced into exile. Some are still in jail, and military courts of intervention still function. At least one state governor was removed by the Central Government.

President Castello Branco says firmly that in the transitional period these same restraints will be applied. He is sensitive to the charge that his is a military regime, pointing to his own determined effort to restore orderly representative government.

The ultimate test will lie not so much in whether Brazil achieves a full democracy but whether out of this transition can come a restored economy and at least relative freedom of political choice. Transposing the terms of Western democracy on a turbulent Latin nation only just emerging from a horrendous ordeal of misgovernment is slightly unreasonable. The curse of corruption and lack of administrative capacity hangs over a people struggling with some beginning success to develop a great undeveloped country.

A singular irony is that the initiator of Brasilia is in voluntary exile in Paris, stripped for 10 years of his civil rights on a charge of corruption. Jucelino Kubitschek began in 1956, when he was President, to build a capital, as the constitution of 1891 provided, in the center of the country rather than in Rio de Janeiro. No highways, no railroads, nothing; marble and steel girders flown in airplanes—this was the drive behind the new city as it came off the drawing boards of Oscar Neimeyer and Brazil's other brilliant architects. The cost—it must have totaled several billion dollars—contributed to the inflation that reached a wild climax a few years later under Goulart.

"But at least," the average Brazilian is inclined to say, "he (Kubitschek) did something for us." The growth rate under Kubitschek was 6 to 7 percent a year. There is also popular agreement that if he could be a candidate next year, he would sweep the country.

AGRICULTURAL SURPLUSES

MR. ANDERSON. Mr. President, across this fruitful land the harvest season is fast approaching. In some areas farmers soon will begin seeding the 1966 wheat crop.

Large yields will bring another round of agricultural surplus. It is a bounty of mixed blessings. On the one hand, our people eat better at less cost than any other nation. On the other, we have over the last 30 years created an agricultural program which had validity at the outset, but has since blossomed into absurdity.

Many of the nearly 125 million Americans living in cities who do not see the overflowing grain elevators and bulging warehouses are becoming increasingly aware of that hardy perennial—the farm problem.

As my colleagues know, in recent years I have tried to stay on the sidelines with respect to Government farm policy. Not that I have not been interested because, as a matter of fact, earlier this year I joined with Senators HOLLAND, ARKEN, HICKENLOOPER, and others, in the introduction of a wheat and feed grains bill—S. 891; and introduced my own cotton bill—S. 2079. Instead, I have concentrated my interest and effort on atomic energy, space, finance, and interior matters.

However, when I saw the Department of Agriculture crop report published last

Tuesday and analyzed its implications to Government costs, I started worrying. There is cause for the public to worry, too.

FEED GRAINS

The latest estimate I have seen puts the 1965 cost of the feed grain program at \$1.6 billion. This is roughly \$400 million more than in 1964. Yet, the latest crop report indicates an all-time high in feed grain production—hardly a success story from the standpoint of reducing production and lowering Government costs.

In Iowa, for example, farmers are scheduled to receive over \$220 million to cut feed grain production. Yet, the latest crop report shows that Iowa will produce an estimated 838 million bushels of corn—roughly 84 million bushels more than was produced in 1964 and 50 million bushels more than the 1959-63 average. If that is an indication of success, we need to revise the meaning of that word.

In its report on the farm bill, the House Agriculture Committee stated that the feed grain legislation during the last 4 years "has reduced the feed grain stocks more than 30 million tons from the record high 85 million-ton level at the end of 1960 crop-marketing seasons. It has kept Government costs down from what they would have been if the surplus had continued to rise." But that was written before the crop report was released. The judgment was premature.

WHEAT

The prospective wheat crop—second highest on record—is 7 percent greater than 1964 and 16 percent above the average of years 1959-63.

COTTON

No firm estimate of production for this year is available as yet, but acreage is estimated to be down only 3 percent from last year. Giving attention to the up-trend in yields which is underway, and the reported good crop conditions this year across the Cotton Belt, the 1965 output probably will surpass last year's 15 million bales. Thus, judging from current cotton production and use estimates, the carryover of cotton will go up—not down.

Much has been said lately by the supporters of the omnibus farm bill now before the House of Representatives with respect to how it would reduce the production of surpluses, cut Government cost, and maintain farm income. If recent history is any criteria, it will fail to accomplish its stated objectives. Furthermore, it would promote and expand the very objectionable philosophy of direct government payments to farmers.

The normal forces of the market system cannot function when a relatively low loan rate is established and direct payments are employed. Farmers respond to the total incentive, not just the loan rate. The crop report dramatically reflects this fact.

As I understand it, the omnibus farm bill now before the House extends and expands Government direct payments to farmers as embodied in the current feed grain, cotton, and wheat programs. We

have a fairly good measure of the results to date. There is nothing to suggest that future results will be any better than what we have seen thus far.

It is now evident that the present cotton program has failed to fulfill the claims made for it at the time of its passage by Congress last year. We should recall that its proponents said that, under the program, consumption of cotton would increase, cost to the taxpayer would decline, consumer prices of cotton goods would be lowered, and the upward trend in manmade fiber use would be halted and farm income for cotton would be maintained. This program has failed on all counts. The proposal for cotton in H.R. 9811 also will fail to solve cotton's problems.

The recently released cotton data clearly shows that fallacy of the present cotton program and the cotton section of H.R. 9811. They are as follows, with comparisons to earlier estimates which have served as a working base.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire table be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[In million bales]				
Year	Item	Earlier estimate	Recent estimate	Difference
1964-65..	Domestic consumption.....	9.3	9.1	-0.2
	Exports.....	4.5	4.0	-.5
	Total consumption.....	13.8	13.1	-.7
	Carryover.....	13.5	14.2	-.7
1965-66..	Domestic consumption.....		9.3	
	Exports.....		4.2	
	Total consumption.....		13.5	

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, note particularly these aspects of the situation:

First. Total consumption for the year under the new program fell below expectations by 700,000 bales and below actual consumption of the preceding year by 629,000 bales.

Second. Estimated total consumption for 1965-66 is estimated at 13.5 million bales or 300,000 bales less than the early estimate for the past year which proved 700,000 bales too high. Thus if this estimate should prove only as wrong as last year's, actual consumption will be less than 12 million bales.

Third. The August 1, 1965, carryover now estimated at 14.2 million bales (compared to the earlier estimate of 13.5 million) is up 2.1 million bales from a year earlier, 3.2 million from 2 years ago, and is only 200,000 bales below the 1956 record of 14.4 million.

How has the farmer fared during the operation of this complicated cotton program? The truth is that his income is down. His price supports have been reduced from 32.47 cents per pound in 1963 to 29 cents per pound in 1965—almost 3½ cents. And with the large stocks of cotton in the hands of CCC, and the constant threat of it being dumped on the market, the price support tends to

set the price. Under the proposal contained in the omnibus farm bill, farmers are being asked to accept a price support at world prices. This could mean a support as low in 1967 as 18 or 20 cents per pound. The difference between this and some target price presumably would be made up in a direct payment to farmers. In my opinion, this would mean the end of the cotton business in most sections of the United States.

How have the textile manufacturers fared under this program? The answer to this in simple terms is very well, indeed. Here is a summary of cloth and raw cotton prices and mill margins by months, using the month of May as the base in each of the years. It is as follows:

Year	[In cents per pound]		
	Average for 20 constructions		
	Unfinished cloth prices	Raw cotton prices	Mill margins
1962.....	61.19	36.13	25.06
1963.....	60.00	36.16	23.84
1964.....	61.29	35.67	25.62
1965.....	64.65	27.35	37.30

It is obvious from the record that raw cotton prices were reduced by the amount of the mill subsidy; however, unfinished cloth prices did not decline by a similar amount—they actually rose. Mill margins widened by even more than the amount of the mill subsidy. These developments are in direct conflict with the promises and assumptions made when the current cotton program was adopted by Congress.

What has happened to cotton exports? Here are the cotton export figures since 1956:

	Bales
1956.....	7,600,000
1957.....	5,717,000
1958.....	2,787,000
1959.....	7,182,000
1960.....	6,632,000
5-year average.....	5,988,000
1961.....	4,913,000
1962.....	3,351,000
1963.....	5,660,000
1964 (estimated cotton situation, USDA, July 1965).....	4,000,000
4-year average.....	4,481,000
Difference.....	1,507,000

Had we maintained our exports at the 1956-60 rate, our supply of upland cotton today would be down to a manageable 6- or 7-million-bale level.

Based on the facts, it seems to me imperative that we take a real look at the current and proposed price support and adjustment program for agriculture. We cannot continue to pour out billions of dollars annually for programs that are aggravating the situation rather than solving some of the problems of overproduction. It is my honest opinion that we must move toward a market-price system rather than reliance on Government-rigged production controls and compensatory payment programs. A Government warehouse is not a market.

Some advocate going the route of a processing tax as currently used in the wheat program. This is a very dangerous route. It penalizes those least able to pay and is an unnecessary Government interference in the business of food production and distribution.

Some history is instructive—it puts the problem in perspective.

Depression-born farm legislation aimed at giving farmers at least minimum income protection through price supports. High support levels were continued during the war as an incentive to production. An almost insatiable demand for food and fiber during the war and immediately after, proved the real incentive to growers, rather than Government supports. As European agriculture recovered from wartime damage, artificially pegged price supports kept American farmers producing beyond demand.

The Korean war generated renewed production requirements. But, after fighting ended, the Commodity Credit Corporation, which finances the price-support program, began an unbroken chain of losses as rigid support spurred accumulation of surpluses.

Basically, there are two approaches to the agricultural dilemma.

In one direction there is political price fixing and strict Government controls. The stark truth is that this approach is not working, has not worked as intended, and in all probability will not work. Yet many diehard advocates continue to try to make it operate and attempt to defend this approach.

The other approach is to move toward a market price system. It would promote orderly marketing without imposing an indefensible burden on an already overburdened Federal budget. This system would also help to bring domestic price-support policies in line with our foreign trade potential. In the process, our dollar earnings abroad would be substantially increased, a boon to our international balance of payments.

It should be appreciated that Government programs have contributed to the solution of some farm problems; however, others, including certain price support and controls programs, have created far more problems than they have solved.

Here is a sampling of the agricultural disarray that has been created—or accentuated—by unsound Government farm programs:

Farm production greater than market needs has been encouraged.

The use of synthetics has been increased.

Important markets at home and abroad have been lost.

Per unit costs have been increased as operations have been reduced in size, and resources have been forced into secondary uses.

The value of allotments has been capitalized into higher land prices.

Existing programs, as a matter of fact, do not represent a serious attempt to control farm production. The truth is that Congress will not vote, administrative agencies will not enforce, and farmers will not accept the kind of controls that

would be necessary to prevent producers from expanding production in response to price support at production incentive levels.

Price support programs can be used properly to facilitate the orderly marketing of farm commodities—provided they are based on economic rather than political considerations. This was an initial objective of the price support system back in the 1930's; however, there is a vast difference between using supports to promote orderly marketing and using them to fix prices without regard to the supply-demand situation.

Congress has the primary responsibility for determining governmental policy in agriculture, as in other fields. In contrast, the principal responsibility of the various executive departments of Government is to administer these policies after they are enacted into law.

I am amazed and disappointed when I hear people attempt to divert attention from the failure of a policy which they supported at the time of its enactment and seek, instead, to pin the blame for farm difficulties on those having the impossible job of successfully administering a wrong policy. It is high time to change this bad policy.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico has presented to the Senate some of the more distasteful facts of agricultural life in the United States.

It is true that we have to take a different look on agriculture that we have been taking. It is particularly true, I believe, that we shall lose most of the export cotton market which we now have unless some different steps are taken. However, even though the Senator from New Mexico has presented these distasteful facts relative to the production of wheat and feed grains and cotton, he did not mention one item which, I believe, is the most devastating section of the House agricultural bill. That is the item relating to dairying.

Dairying is the most important of all agricultural activities in the United States, when one counts the meat products derived from the dairy herd, as well as milk and its products.

The American family dairy is rapidly going out of business. The 50-cow dairy no longer supports a family.

The production of dairy products is passing into the hands of corporations to a very large extent, which perhaps may be engaged in other business endeavors, as well as farming.

It is my opinion that, if the House proposal for dairying passes as now written, most of the family dairying in the United States will vanish within the next 5 to 10 years.

In New England they are already talking in terms of thousand cow dairies. There is one within a few miles of me now.

There is every indication that several more will be established within the next year or two.

A dairy farm or a dairy operation today may encompass an area as much as

30 or 40 miles across, with these large herd owners and operators, usually corporations, requiring the use of land in an adjoining county.

I do not like to see the family dairy farmer go out of business. I realize it is a trend. I do not know that there is anything we can do legislatively to stop it, but what the House proposes will result in putting the producing end of the dairy industry in fewer hands than we have already seen.

Mr. ANDERSON. I hope the dairy farmer will continue to stay. The Senator from Vermont has surely proved to be a friend of the dairy farmer for a long time. I can personally bear testimony to that fact from his efforts when I was Secretary of Agriculture. I gave up a 400-cow dairy many years ago. It was a smart thing to do financially.

We did not have to worry about the losses. The dairy situation is bad. I have not gone into that particularly for the reason that I am more interested in the cotton situation than I am in the dairy industry. I have been studying the cotton legislation that has been proposed. I think the present cotton situation is bad. I therefore introduced a bill which is what I think should be passed by Congress. I am glad that the Senate from Vermont was present in the Agriculture Committee when I explained my bill. I do not expect anybody to pay much attention to it, because each one is determined to go his own course, but the cotton problem is not good, and the problem is not going to disappear by itself.

Although it may be unpopular for a Democrat to say so, I think the act passed in 1958 for a cotton program was a good one. The man administering it started in the right direction, but, unfortunately, in 1961, there was a new price program which was a mistake. I think his advice was bad. I think he could have done a much better job with better advice. The cotton problem must be dealt with. It will continue, unless the present pattern is stopped.

Mr. AIKEN. I would like to dispel the pessimism of the Senator from New Mexico when he says that no one will pay attention to what he says. I am sure many people will pay attention to what he says. They may not agree or like it, but what the Senator is saying today is not going to go unnoticed.

I agree with what the Senator says that the cotton program adopted in 1958 was a good one. We had another bill last year, which the cotton mills avidly supported, and which has resulted in \$400 million going to the cotton mills, and a little higher price having to be paid by the consumers, and a little less money going to the cotton producers. I understand the cotton mills want that law continued. I can understand why they do, because they will never get any easier money. In fact, it resulted in the mills making record profits, but the cost was charged to agriculture, which it should not have been.

Mr. ANDERSON. The statement of the Senator from Vermont about the mills being satisfied with the law is true. The table which I inserted shows the mill margin in 1962 was 25.06 cents a

pound, but the mill margin in 1965 was 37 cents a pound. Any time a mill can make a jump from 25.06 cents to 37 cents, it is like eating watermelon without having to spit out the pits.

Mr. AIKEN. It is easy to understand why the mills would like to have the law continued.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have put these statements in the RECORD so I could refresh my recollection. In 1964 I wrote a long letter to a distinguished friend of mine in which I suggested that certain things would happen if certain provisions which were being suggested were enacted into law. They were enacted into law. All the things I predicted have happened. If we do not watch these farm programs, we can get into a bad situation. We should confront the problem and do something about it.

I can testify to the fine work that the Senator from Vermont has done in trying to develop good policies. I am happy that I have had an opportunity to be associated with him in several agricultural areas.

Mr. AIKEN. May I again assure the Senator that his remarks this morning will not go unnoticed, and I have a feeling that they will be noticed by some important people.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator.

PERPETUATING THE REPUBLIC AND SEEKING A BETTER WORLD—REMARKS OF SENATOR KUCHEL BEFORE INTERNATIONAL PLATFORM ASSOCIATION

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I had the privilege of addressing the International Platform Association at its convention in Washington, D.C., on Tuesday, August 3, 1963. I ask unanimous consent that a portion of those remarks be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERPETUATING THE REPUBLIC AND SEEKING A BETTER WORLD

(Partial text of remarks by U.S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL before the International Platform Association, August 3, 1965)

Tonight, I wish to speak, first, as an American, sharing a common concern over the grave difficulties which beset our Nation, and, then, to speak as a partisan, sensing a crucial need for a revitalized Republican party, qualified to receive the people's faith, able to win elections, and thus to resume, fully, its historic and constructive role in the government of our Republic. I devotedly believe that the enormous problems which plague our people will best be solved against the background of a healthy two-party system. I like that kind of a check and balance. So, I feel assured, do you.

Vast changes are taking place, at home, and across the oceans, in every hemisphere, in the skies and beyond. Those changes surely are affecting, and will affect, our American society, and the governmental policies, domestic, and foreign, which guide us, and, indeed, mankind everywhere.

A new chapter in American foreign policy is now unfolding halfway around the globe in southeast Asia. From a handful of Americans, civilian and military, sent to South Vietnam in 1954 "to advise and assist," a new nation-state, we are now proceeding

there, in force, indeed, in very great force, prepared to remain for years, or longer. Thus, over a decade, our response to a unilateral call for aid, has now become a vast and expanding defensive military effort by the United States in the face of mounting aggression by the Communist neighbors of South Vietnam. This is a period of increasing danger to our country and to all our aspirations for the peoples of the world to live together, free from the threat of armed attack, able to use their talents to better and to improve our world society. Under all these melancholy circumstances, there is only one course for our country to pursue.

We shall not "dishonor our word or abandon our commitment"—the President's phrase—and, quite aside from the stakes of freedom for South Vietnam, "an Asia"—again the President's words—"so threatened by Communist domination would imperil the security of the United States itself." This crisis, and all that it portends, in men, and money, and time, requires our people to support the President's announcement of the position of the United States.

You do not enhance your reputation for honor by voluntarily assuming an obligation, and then by abruptly chucking it aside. Such course of action would undermine, if not, indeed, destroy, the faith of your friends; and your enemies with great glee would begin feverishly to recalculate the risks involved in deciding to punch you on the nose.

But the fact is, the American people are dedicated to peace, a peace with honor and with justice. We fought successfully, in two World Wars, because we loved our liberties and we were willing to fight for them. And a little over 20 years ago, we helped to fashion the United Nations simply because we continued to believe in peace. That "town meeting of the world" remains a potential avenue through which the cause of a just peace in Indochina might be advanced in spite of the summary rejection yesterday by Hanoi of our President's urging that the U.N. utilize its energies to find ways to halt aggression and to bring peace to Vietnam.

There is every reason for the U.N. to push and prod and labor, to marshal its strength and the opinions of its member nations, in a never-ending search for an acceptable formula to restore peace and security in southeast Asia. The entire world has a prime interest in the cessation of all acts of aggression and terror.

The presence of the United States in Indochina is simply to preserve the freedom of the South Vietnamese people against the cruel terror and sustained attack by her Communist neighbors. I need hardly add that we have no territorial or imperialistic designs at all.

The U.N. must not be deterred by the repeated rebuffs from Hanoi and Peking. Its exertions must continue at the same time that the United States continues to apply increasing defensive force to help South Vietnam, as the President may determine, in accordance with the Southeast Asia Treaty, and the joint resolution of the Congress of 1 year ago.

Risks abound in however we respond to the terror of Hanoi and Peking. Beyond all the wanton killing inflicted by the Asian Reds on their neighbors, is the grim and foreboding development of Red China into a nation of nuclear arms. Americans are deeply concerned over all these dangerous prospects, and all their frightful potential on down the road of time, when nuclear proliferation would have proceeded to place Red China, and some small countries, as well, within the nuclear club. The entire world is concerned. Surely, Moscow's surprising and sudden agreement to resume the disarmament talks in Geneva, now underway, reflects an awareness that nuclear war would wreak desolation on the East as well as on the West. At any rate, international coopera-

tion is going to be required in finally achieving peace in southeast Asia, or elsewhere. The balance of terror between the two great nuclear powers, as a means of staving off a global obliteration, is going to require the cooperation of all nations, or most nations, and international guarantees which must be kept.

The real tragedy, therefore, of the struggle against communism in southeast Asia is that, so far, the United States stands almost alone. Some few flags of free countries and some personnel serving under them are with us, and I particularly salute the Australians, the New Zealanders and the South Koreans. But the main supply of men and equipment comes from the United States. How sad it is that our comrades in arms of the 1940's do not stand together to stem the onslaught of the Asiatic Reds.

In his superb "History of the Second World War," Winston Churchill titled his final volume "Triumph and Tragedy." He set down the theme for that volume as "How the great democracies triumphed and so were able to resume the follies which had so nearly cost them their life." The tragedy is that the follies, having been resumed, apparently continue. Nations who value their liberties, and who together fought to preserve them, now appear, at least some of them, to desire to walk alone. The time-proven theory in union there is strength is not being applied very well today by free peoples. Finally, nations which wish peace, irrespective of the type of internal government they practice, are, together, going to have to apply this theory in sustaining peace, or the future is going to be pretty bleak.

Differences, some of which are growing, exist between the nations of the West, as, indeed, differences, some of which appear both growing and irreconcilable, exist between members of the Communist world. Red China almost daily inveighs against the Soviet Union. But, the great democracies, also, on occasion, throw bricks and barbs at one another. In international relations, there has arisen on many occasions the most narrow kind of nationalism hindering the hopes of the many for common progress in trade and commerce and culture, even for arrangements for common defense. I believe in the independence of the United States. I want her to remain preeminently strong. I believe also in the interdependence of free nations, striving for a just peace, for a world of law and order, working together, rid of most of their follies and their foolishness and their super selfishness. For the world neighborhood is growing smaller.

In the beginning of these comments, I said I sensed the need of a revitalized Republican Party, rededicated to the cause of solving the current problems of the American people, and doing it with a nobility of purpose which characterized its finest moments from Lincoln to Eisenhower. The forward progress of this Nation was given great impetus under great Republican chief executives.

When I was appointed to the U.S. Senate, shortly before the commencement of General Eisenhower's administration, my party could look forward to controlling the Congress, however slight its majority may have been. But it did not last for long. Many milestones of progress were passed during the Eisenhower years, which I do not need to enumerate tonight. Democrats joined Republicans in approving Eisenhower's lead. My party became the minority in the Congress during the ensuing 8-year period, and we have remained a minority ever since. In the holocaust of November 1964, our numbers were reduced to less than a third in each House. About 60 new Democratic Congressmen were elected in the House of Representatives. In the Senate, men of stature and reputation, incumbent Republicans, were swept away to defeat, yet their record, indeed, the record of the Republican Party

in the Senate had been a very good one. We gave overwhelming support to civil rights legislation which, down to today, has always been pretty well written on the Republican side. We gave substantial support to legislation providing for educational opportunity and manpower retraining, to the nuclear treaty, the United Nations loan and the mutual security program, to mention a very few. My party suffered in the 1964 elections because the people believed we were not keeping faith with our basic humanitarian Lincoln creed.

The fact is my party suffers today in some parts of this country by reason of the strange and singular antics of some of its self-anointed spokesmen. One young so-called Republican group in my State is not content with opposing the voting right legislation now about to be enacted in Congress. It demands that all Federal laws now on the statute books dealing with civil rights be repealed. It demands the impeachment of our Chief Justice, one of the greatest Americans this country has yet produced. It wants to destroy the United Nations, and it demands that we abrogate the nuclear test ban treaty. It seeks repeal of the Federal income tax. It views the Arms Control Agency as some kind of a Communist plot.

I need hardly tell this audience that every one of these outrageous proposals is the very antithesis of Republican principle and Republican history, completely at variance with the most elementary rules of reason and with the Lincoln legend. If they qualify as political tenets, which I very much doubt, they are absurd.

How then can the people of the United States look forward to two vigorous contending forward-looking American political parties? This question is important not simply to registered Republicans but to every citizen in the land.

A persistent imbalance in political power in favor of a single political party poses considerable peril to our system, even though the laws provide a paper opportunity at regular intervals for potential change. A persistent partisan imbalance in any level of our Government is conducive to political autocracy, and a little wheeling and dealing, or worse. There is one less important check or balance. And to the habitual losers, there is frustration, despair, and occasional irresponsibility.

Such an imbalance may well continue in a society of apparent plenty. Over time, a lack of change and a lack of dynamic political exertions could indicate some superficial comfort. Comfort breeds habit. But with habit, comes inertia, and inertia produces a sterility of the mind.

Such a society lives too near to danger. All the procedures of a well-established written Constitution and all the armaments that a scientific elite can devise cannot avert danger for such a society. Sterility of the mind means that men all too easily accept appearance for reality, imagery for content, public relations for public programs. Such sterility can foster a continued nibbling at the edges of poverty and unemployment rather than facing the hard decisions required, the moral awakening involved, and the sacrifice needed to expand educational, health, and job opportunities for all in our American society.

Nowhere is such mental sterility more apparent in our cities which continue to be clogged with slums, with traffic, and with crime. Racial tensions remain. All the urban renewal and public housing in the world will not mean a better America unless we work to aid people in becoming better. Money alone, no matter how bountifully expended, does not make for morality. Legislation alone cannot guarantee solutions.

Once again, the Republican Party must become a national party dedicated to the national interest. Its voice must be the same

in Mississippi, in the Carolinas, and in New York and California. It must speak in terms of moderation and of progress. The cornerstone of its grand strategy must be the Emancipator's philosophy on our Government's legitimate objective: "to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or so well do for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, Government ought not to interfere."

Our party needs to recognize the eternal validity of our system of free competitive enterprise, so that the public and the private sectors of our economy will not work at cross-purposes nor be in conflict. Its doors need to be open, with the welcome mat plainly in view, soliciting membership from all walks of life and all races and creeds. In short, the Republican Party must represent an honest cross section of the American people, rich and poor, black and white, big and little, who yearn to perpetuate and to improve our Republic, and to play our part seeking a better world.

SBA DECISION TO SELL BANKABLE LOANS TO PRIVATE ENTERPRISE MAKES SENSE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday Mr. Eugene P. Foley, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, announced that the SBA had decided to sell, without recourse, certain direct and immediate participation loans made after Thursday, August 12, to private purchasers. The buyers of these loans will be permitted to charge the prevailing rate in the area in which the buyer is located, but in no event will the rate exceed 7½ percent. SBA will make the rate determination to be used in the various parts of the country.

This plan will not affect guaranteed loans, economic opportunity loans, disaster loans, or loans made to local development companies. However, it will apply to loans made in depressed areas at 4 percent.

This new ruling is based on an internal study made by SBA which showed that roughly 20 percent of SBA borrowers could have obtained a bank loan on reasonable terms. As is well known, the basic SBA Act states that no loan shall be made by SBA unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available on reasonable terms. SBA regulations require a prospective borrower to furnish the names of the banks to which it has applied and the reason it was unable to obtain the loan. SBA requires that if the trading area in which the applicant is located is of any size two turndowns are to be furnished including the applicant's bank of account; if the applicant is located in a small town one bank turndown is acceptable.

I have stated that these "friendly turndowns" by banks are practically automatic and are not conclusive evidence that a small business is unable to get financing on reasonable terms.

It seems to me that the study which shows that many of these loans are bankable, to the extent of 20 percent, which I think is a conservative estimate, confirms my suspicions.

This new plan will give SBA a more efficient check on bankable loans and

will, therefore, get the Federal Government out of competition with banks.

The sale of these loans that SBA has determined are bankable to banks in the area in which the small business is located will also go far to improve the credit position of the small business in his community. His credit worthiness will be proved locally rather than to some big Government agency in far off Washington.

Mr. Foley and President Johnson are to be congratulated for taking this bold step which will make SBA money available to those small businesses which, in fact, are not able to obtain a loan on reasonable terms from banks or other financial institutions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement issued by SBA on this new plan be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ESCALATION OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION LOANS

(Statement issued by the Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C., August 10, 1965)

The Small Business Administration will announce its decision to sell direct and immediate participation loans made after Thursday, August 12, to private purchasers. No existing loans will be affected in any way. Buyers will be permitted to charge up to 7½ percent interest but in accordance with regional rates determined by SBA.

This decision will not affect guaranteed loans, economic opportunity loans, disaster loans, or loans to local development companies. It will, however, apply to loans made in depressed areas at 4 percent.

The new ruling will underline SBA's determination to serve small business without competing with banks. A recent internal review showed that 20 percent of SBA borrowers could have gotten a bank loan on reasonable terms. But in order to take advantage of SBA's low interest rates, they managed to obtain "friendly refusal" from commercial lenders. SBA feels these firms frustrate congressional will by using funds intended for needy firms.

The decision to put certain new SBA loans on the market in the future, accomplishes two things: First, SBA can more readily identify those firms that could have—or can now—borrow private capital at reasonable terms. Second, SBA can get these loans off the books and have more money to lend firms that have no ready access to private financing.

No SBA loans will be sold until it has been held for 90 days.

SBA borrowers will be given 30 days' notice of SBA's intent to sell.

All direct loans will be offered to the borrowers' banks. Participation loans will be offered to the participating banks. If the offers are not accepted, SBA will then decide whether to try and sell the loan to another bank, trust fund, or pension fund.

All loans will be sold without recourse. SBA will regulate the interest rate purchasers will be allowed to charge. A nationwide base rate will be based on current market conditions and SBA's need and goals. SBA will then adjust the base rate according to State interest rate differentials. The 7½-percent rate maximum will be set to protect borrowers, but in most cases the rate actually charged will be below this limit.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ASPEN AWARD—ASPEN INSTITUTE FOR HUMANISTIC STUDIES, ASPEN, COLO., AUGUST 1965

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, Aspen, Colo., is a tiny mountain town cradled between peaks of snow and rock which soar 14,000 feet into the clouds. In the 1880's, 15,000 persons lived in Aspen, swarming over the lower slopes in the fruitful search for silver. But in the early 1900's, when the cross of gold was raised, this small community seemed permanently darkened by its shadow.

Yet something happened. Out of the hope, vision, and relentless energy of one man came a new and a different Aspen. More than anything else, Walter Paul Paepcke, board chairman for Container Corp. of America, believed in education as the basis of the moral and esthetic sense in man. And the organization which he founded, the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, is the physical reflection of that belief.

This summer, as part of the executive discussion program foreseen by Paepcke, such men as Mortimer J. Adler, James Conant, Theodore Kheel, Rev. James Pike, the Honorable Byran White, and Leonard Bernstein are in Aspen to lead small seminar sessions of business executives which relate the progress of key ideas in Western thought to contemporary society.

And also this summer, Martha Graham, our greatest living dancer, received the second Aspen Award, the \$30,000 tribute of the humanities.

The prize was created last year as an extension of the institute's discussion and conference programs in the humanities. It is intended to honor "that person who, anywhere in the world, has made the greatest contribution to the humanities."

British composer Benjamin Britten received the first award for his interpretations through music of man's feelings, moods, and thoughts, and his acceptance remarks have gained for the award a remarkable stature.

Over the past years, I have gained a deep and immutable respect for the men who have carried on the work of Walter Paepcke. In particular, I mean Robert O. Anderson, chairman of the board, and Alvin C. Eurich, president of the Aspen Institute.

The recognition in the humanities which their award has and will continue to effect is a tribute to the State of Colorado, to the Nation, and to men and women throughout the world. The Aspen Award is unique in recognizing man's quest for self-understanding. For that reason, I commend its meaning to my colleagues.

THE ASPEN AWARD

The future of the Aspen Award has been underwritten by a permanent endowment of Robert O. Anderson, chairman of the board for the Aspen Institute. Yet Anderson has given the award what is perhaps a more important birth in its spiritual endowment.

For the personal philosophy which has led to both the conception and the creation of the award looks only to its purpose—the recognition of the humanities as an integral part of man's existence. This theme is the touchstone in Anderson's life and was heard in its force and conviction last June at the graduating ceremonies of Colorado College where Anderson was awarded an honorary doctor of humane letters degree:

As we reach a point in our national existence where we can satisfy our creature comforts, more and more people are beginning to realize that there must be more to life. As a result we see a growing uneasiness, a boredom with a life totally oriented toward material things, and the need for new and more purposeful challenges. Science and technology can vastly improve our standard of living and general well-being, but to widen our interests and to enjoy life, we must have more than this. In some way we must learn to enjoy the creative side of life embraced by the humanities.

Bob Anderson lives in Roswell, N. Mex., a small oil town on the plains of the Southwest, and his spirit of free enterprise is coupled with a thoughtful stature. He is now chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, and vice chairman and trustee of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

This man has proven to be far more than an economic benefactor for the Aspen Institute. With his belief in the need for understanding of all products of man's creativity, Anderson has helped to make the institute a home of world culture, where visitors and guests can see and hear great minds in thoughtful deliberation, and where businessmen and resources guests can inquire together into the literature and the ideas of mankind, as they have developed over the centuries. Anderson's philosophical and introspective nature are coupled with a boundless energy and an intense desire to achieve goals. This combination of talents may well make the Aspen Institute a singular but powerful voice in the coming years of technological revolution.

ALVIN C. EURICH: THE ASPEN INSTITUTE

Simultaneously with the announcement a year ago of the creation of the Aspen Award, Alvin C. Eurich, long time vice president of the Ford Foundation and one of the country's most honored educators, was named by Anderson as president of the institute.

Upon the creative vision of Walter Paepcke and the humanistic enterprise of Robert Anderson, Eurich has assembled men of letters, science, government, education, and business to meet in seminar sessions which consider ideas and ideals in contemporary society. Dr. Eurich himself has experience in all these fields and is dedicated to finding a balance and understanding among them.

Within his general theme of "Man in 1980" Eurich has brought Stewart Udall to Aspen to participate with American and foreign experts in a conference on the population explosion, and a group of college and university presidents from such schools as California Institute of Technology and Chicago University to discuss higher education in 1980.

Eurich has defined a hard task both for the institute and for himself. This is perhaps best explained in a remark made last June to the graduating class of Albion College in Michigan:

How, fully recognizing the achievements of science and technology, can we build upon them a superstructure of life-enhancing and soul-satisfying ideas and ideals? What this really comes to is: How in the midst of the most advanced scientific civilization in the world, can we become more mature in our thinking about those ideas that have shaped our civilization? This is the principal concern of the humanities.

This theme is similar to that of Anderson's and is also a personal one. It is reflected in his statement on the selection of Martha Graham as the second winner of the Aspen Award.

Martha Graham has reaffirmed the primacy of the human spirit in an age dominated by science and technology.

The Aspen award is a product of both Robert Anderson and Alvin Eurich. Their strength and their determination are clearly visible in every activity which the institute initiates. Yet they have both taken care to allow the cooperative spirit of inquiry so vital to humanistic pursuit remain intact once the programs have been established.

To insure impartiality in the award's selection board, the members were chosen by position. They now include Frederick Burkhardt, president of the American Council of Learned Societies, William De Vane, president of the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa; Lord Franks, provost of Worcester College, Oxford; Henry Allen Moe, president of the American Philosophical Society, and Eurich, as president of the institute. The award is an international one, and in the words of Robert Anderson will be awarded "to people in their peak productive years, not 80-year-old big names who have already been acclaimed in their lifetimes but whose work is all behind them."

Martha Graham, who has given our country the one art form which is originally its own, was chosen from over 1,000 nominations from throughout the world.

THE ASPEN AWARD: 1965 CONVOCATION

Henry Allen Moe, speaking for the selection board, and Roger L. Stevens, special assistant to the President in the arts, gave a short introductory talk at the convocation held in Aspen in her honor on July 30.

HENRY ALLEN MOE

Moe, the first speaker, described Miss Graham as the "Child of the Magna Carta," observing that, in 1936, when she badly needed both the money and the prestige, Martha Graham declined vehemently to accept an offer of Adolf Hit-

ler to perform at the Olympic games which were held in Berlin that year. He commented that she had used the charter's freedom well:

For she has given the dance a new dynamics and a new discipline and, above all, she has established the creative role of the human body—which the philosophers only now think they are discovering * * * all dancers, for all foreseeable time, will not dance as they would have danced had there not been Martha Graham to show the way. More could hardly be said—having regard to his different art—of William Shakespeare.

The philosopher then added a remarkable tribute. "She created an American dance in which feet are used as the Lord made feet to be used—an American dance as great as, and more original than, any."

ROGER STEVENS

Roger Stevens began by speaking of the creation of the National Council on the Arts, and indicated that the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts has now reached its financial goals. He then added, however, that the "best example of the tremendous increase and growth of interest in the arts is the fact that we are here today to honor Martha Graham."

Stevens spoke of the "natural treasure" which Miss Graham had left us, commenting that "much of that natural treasure is in danger of being lost for all time. Only three of her works have been filmed and the bulk of her great imaginative repertory may pass into history unrecorded."

M'NEIL LOWRY

McNeil Lowry followed Moe and Stevens with the major address "Art and Intensity," and, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lowry's remarks be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ART AND INTENSITY

(By W. McNeil Lowry, vice president, the Ford Foundation)

Rare indeed in the life of the arts does the work of a single great artist become the esthetic of the artistic medium itself. And when this happens, all of us—artists and nonartists alike—finally know. If the award to be given today were to be made only to artists whose careers represented this fusion of the art form, it could not be given each year, or even each decade. But on this occasion in 1965 the criterion is abundantly and creatively met. The work of Martha Graham has fused and informed the esthetic of modern dance itself. My congratulations to the selection committee are unalloyed, but I do have one sober word to leave with them: They have made their task in other years a difficult one. They have given Miss Graham an award. She has given them a standard it will not be easy to maintain.

So to infuse one's own esthetic in the medium in which one creates and performs is a complex of many elements, and certainly not all of the elements are definable, at least not by me. Even those elements that are the most identifiable are not always the most tangible—we can neither measure them nor create foolproof instruments or mechanisms by which to transmit them. There is at least one such intangible element in the

achievement about which I am confident, however. It is the element of intensity. There are other words that come close to denoting the same element, in the arts, anyway—words like concentration, commitment, compulsion. For me, however, intensity in an artist comprehends these other motives and attitudes and then embraces even more. Moving Miss Graham's artistic achievement and compounded within it is an intensity which could not but inform the esthetic of the dance as we know it in the 20th century. This is what has led some critics of the last generation to say (I am sure with not unalloyed pleasure to Miss Graham) that she is modern dance and that modern dance is she, as if there were no other artists of professional distinction in the field. This is not what they meant. They recognized that Miss Graham's work on the stage gave the medium of interpretive dance its own esthetic, that what she created, in effect, was the form itself. How rarely in the history of the creative and performing arts has this fusion occurred. Martha Graham's career honors all of us, and not merely the institution that today honors her.

I am sure you now understand that when I speak of intensity in the arts I am not speaking of a merely technical element. There is intensity in the technique revealed by Miss Graham and other great talents on the stage. But I am concerned today with a much more comprehensive kind of element—ethical as well as technical, instrumental in its effects, shaping and focusing, nurturing and directing. When I extract from all my thoughts and observations about the arts this intangible of intensity, for myself at least I extract a touchstone by which the cultural developments of our own time and Nation may be defined and weighed.

Those developments are various, and at this particular time in our history both more rapid and more popular than ever before, if we do not restrict ourselves to the all important and all meaningful one of individual creation which Martha Graham and a few other Americans represent. To the more broadly cultural developments of the past 10 years we have witnesses * * *. Most of them are in one way or another patrons, but in a different way from the patron who has proved most important to Miss Graham herself, for example. We have not only the individual patron, but the organized one, the one who makes patronage itself a profession, and not any longer in the corporate and private sector alone but in the public, as the presence of Governor Love and Mr. Stevens tells us. And we have an institution which has come into being to say for our society that achievement in the humanities today merits conspicuous recognition.

If this scene were unique in the United States it would still be important, but its uniqueness derives only from Miss Graham's achievement and the recognition being paid to it. Even in the 8 years in which it has been my privilege to conduct the most intensive inquiry into the state of the arts in the United States, we have seen the development of our cultural life become supremely popular both as an activity and as a burden for speechmaking. If the Ford Foundation had so chosen—and fortunately it did not—it could have spent on conferences, seminars, and reports about half of all the money it has invested since 1957 in artists and their professional outlets. It could have spent sevenfold of this for cultural centers, arts councils, festivals or other general manifestations of the idea that there is, or ought to be, some kind of cultural explosion on the landscape.

I have on other occasions attempted to analyze what historical and social factors have made these manifestations come to a head in our time. The most basic are the most subject to generalization. Three fac-

tors have roughly coincided in time: the closing of the American land frontier, the emergence of the United States as a world power, and the numerical importance of the college-trained population. When the land frontier closed, not every able or compulsive citizen could find an outlet for his energy in the new frontiers of finance, economic development, and industrial management. Even many who could do so had energies left over for other identifications in their communities. The complexities of America's new position in a threatened world order drove many minds inward, and at a time when a new affluence brought (though not universally) increased leisure. Meanwhile the universities, though doing a generally inadequate job in training young people as artists, had done an important job in training audiences for the arts. New styles in drama are supported by an audience that has been educated in colleges and universities; new fads in painting and sculpture are kept alive, critically and otherwise, by allied interests.

Each of these general factors has its corollary, or more than one. In the late thirties and forties, when the domestic soil was particularly fertile, there was an influx into the United States of some of Europe's most creative artists. Also, U.S. involvement in World War II and the presence of millions of young Americans in Europe undoubtedly stimulated the audience for opera and dance; the surprising interest in the latter in almost every region of the country is strictly a postwar phenomenon. Probably related to all three general factors is a vague desire to escape both the materialism of the American past and the stresses of new international tensions. Many adults presumably look back upon their college experience and wonder if they paid enough attention to their cultural heritage or learned how to interpret it in their own lives. If a painting after all means more than an object for economic speculation, what does it mean?

I am concerned in my remarks today, however, not with the basic causes of our new interest in the arts but with some of their effects. Most of all I am concerned that so many of the manifestations of increasing interest in our cultural resources, welcome as they might be, do not penetrate below the surface not only of art but of the cultural climate which can permit the shaping and development of artistic enterprise.

When I say that there is too often a lack of intensity in the preoccupation of persons and agencies who proclaim our cultural development as their objective, I do not mean there is not a great deal of frenzied activity. What appears often to happen is that mere activity is taken to be a guarantee of commitment and choice. One man's, one group's, one community's activity is promoted as equal to every other, even though activity, if that is the sole test, by itself is indiscriminating. What would we think of the probable results if social and business leaders of our communities, the press, young persons fresh from school, and one or two specialists in fundraising were to assume leadership for the development of our scientific resources and proclaim that each enterprise, each scientist, were as good as another, as important as another, as professional as another? What demands would we put upon them to attempt to focus their efforts, to subject them to the most rigorous standards? Are our artistic resources less complex, more homogeneous, more purchasable as mere commodities?

The kind of intensity that informs the essence of art is at bottom the kind that informs the essence of science, since both are at the deepest core creative. But even at far more mundane and pedestrian levels than the creative core, artistic performance, artistic continuity, artistic enterprise de-

pend upon that intensity which embraces commitment, focus, and the highest sense of craft. Intangible as these elements are, they can be used as touchstones, even by the layman, if his interest is the arts, which are about the artist and the artistic director, rather than social development, which is about a lot of other things.

Though there is still by no means enough money to give legitimate support to the arts in our time and the public has not found the exact means to provide the cultural resources it is beginning to demand, the limitations upon the development of the arts in the next generation will not be financial. Or perhaps we should say that financial limitations will not be crucial unless too many of the agencies and sources of support continue to divert a disproportionate investment of moneys into buildings, councils, conferences, studies, festivals, and other secondary or useless manifestations of a polite cultural urge.

The limitations upon the development of the arts in this era will be found, I think, in two distinct realms, one in which the artists and artistic directors exist and one that includes the rest of us.

In the first and crucial instance, the arts will flourish only in proportion to the intense, driving, focused and compulsive persons who can give force and direction to artistic enterprises, large or small. This is not meant to be a truism: I am not saying that we shall not have literature without writers, music without composers, dance without choreographers and dancers. Of course. I am saying rather than the number of intense, committed, talented persons capable of giving both force and focus to the skeletal structure of artistic enterprise appear to be very, very few.

This is true despite the swirl of activity in the name of "art" that covers the landscape, and even the increased strength that philanthropic and other support has injected into the enterprises of a few tested and committed persons. Let me give you an example from the experience of one of those philanthropies, the Ford Foundation. Before we moved to strengthen to some degree the resident professional theater, the few institutions in that field certainly did not represent what is now called a "movement." Today even the Wall Street Journal tells businessmen their communities are not respectable unless they contain a resident acting company. And many communities now do. But what we really have is too often mere indiscriminate activity, some kind of surrogate for either theater or art, an ectoplasmic pre-life substitute, without standards, without craft, without direction. Actually it will be another decade before we can tell whether independent repertory companies of artistic significance will exist on the American scene, and until then the only kind of movement we shall see is a circular one without a center.

In the performing arts, the distinction between the amateur and the professional is made only when subjected to some kind of focus, and that focus usually is provided by another person—director, artistic producer, choreographer, whatever—and the instrumentality he in turn creates. In those media that in the United States are the most traditional and the most easily organized, such as the symphony orchestra, the focus is less complex to create, but even in this medium there are forces under the control of the conductor and other forces that are not.

The artistic director burdened with intensity, organized to the point of distortion, is the most important key to the development of our artistic resources. The other limitation upon what will happen in the next generation is a value factor. With what degree of intensity and insight can the patron and the public come to understand that

the arts are not about society, status (either of a person or of a community), business or even about education but about the artist and the artistic director and their sense of craft?

If one man's activity is as good as another, if one group or company has as much claim on our society as another, if costly cultural edifices are to be erected as clean playhouses for amateurs, this loudly hailed new day is not one for art and the artist. It may have sociological significance for our use of leisure, but on this test culture is more costly than beer or racetracks. Many people, but not enough, are concerned that in large part the promoters of a new national enterprise in culture—individual, corporate, or governmental—are rapidly contributing to the popularization and vulgarization of the artistic media and standards they profess to serve.

Evidence lies on every hand. Both individual patrons and communities acting in that role too often back an artistic enterprise as a social badge for today and a monument for tomorrow. When the proprietary motive is also touched, as it frequently is, the contest is not over artistic performance but over money or publicity. When the question becomes a social one, it is not about art but about power.

Another example is in the performance of the press. Until quite recently the arts were not considered by the publishers important as news, though they had a place on the society page. Slowly they have become newsworthy, but quite inexplicably the standards of coverage, even those of accuracy, are not the standards used by our leading newspapers when covering political or even scientific affairs. If some person styling himself a scientist said he was embarking tomorrow for the moon, even our least professional reporters and editors would not play the story straight. But if he said he was establishing the world's leading drama center and negotiating with Sir Laurence Olivier to run it, his story would be played straight in the Nation's leading papers. Newspaper standards in reporting about the arts have only relative significance, I agree, though again it means that our professed interest in these subjects is in many areas of our life superficial. And it is not insignificant to our cultural development that the press weakens rather than sharpens popular discrimination of what creativity and the creative process are about. Everything is treated alike, as if we could buy culture by the yard.

In talking about newspaper coverage of the arts, I have not mentioned the critics, always a dangerous subject for anyone but a critic. The only complaint I have lies at the door of the publishers. They cannot bring themselves to think that the background and training required of a newspaper critic of one of the creative or performing arts is very important, not at least when compared to what they expect of men in other departments of the newspaper. From time to time we see the phenomenon of a man through long experience covering one of the arts emerging as a distinguished and discriminating voice, the voice of John Martin in the dance or of Walter Kerr in theater, for example. These are rare, and they will continue to be so until publishers and editors are more intensely concerned with our cultural life.

Reporters—and sometimes critics, too, I am afraid—contribute also to the indiscriminate influence of the social or status motives of artistic patrons and entrepreneurs. Publicity brings influence and often brings money. The contest between artistic groups is not always settled, alas, on artistic criteria.

The same game can be played by the artist lacking in his own intensity of commitment. Art can be obscured or even temporarily ruled by faddists if they are success-

ful in obtaining publicity from the press, from owners of galleries, from entrepreneurs who care only for sensations or novelties. It is not only in the theater that activity in the name of art becomes "show business."

Without an intense personal vision and commitment, the artist betrays his medium, no matter how much in vogue may be the style he attempts. This is a truism, of course. But I think we can go farther. Intensity, the sense of commitment, the focus that comes from involvement must exist in the whole complex of persons and forces required for the development of our artistic resources. At their different and less creative levels, private or public patrons, critics, all those in the enterprise must see the core of the artistic experience and understand its demands.

At their most intense realization, the arts become the reflection of man's inner self and of the external environment in which he is so perilously and feebly placed. But they do not reflect life without changing it—we are changing as the intensity of the artistic realization is reached; it is the moment of interchange that is the moment both of art and of truth. In the performing arts, every element, even the most general, that prepares for the moment is a part of the artistic process. We cannot have one set of standards for the process and another for art. Out of amateur, wasteful, or haphazard elements in its environment, art will not develop. There is a standard of craft not only for the creator or the performer but for the producer, the manager, yes, even for the entrepreneur and the patron.

We can define "the humanities" descriptively in terms of their subject matter. It has always been more difficult for those who attempted to explain the humanities in terms of their use. The Aspen Institute says that achievement in the humanities is achievement in "explaining and strengthening man's sense of his own nature, purpose and destiny." What humane learning does toward these high goals, art does, but with more intensity. How, therefore, can we serve art, even indirectly, if we regard it superficially, merely as activity, purchasable, inchoate, indiscriminate? We can serve it only in the full glare of its burning core.

ALVIN C. EURICH

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, Alvin C. Eurich presented the Aspen Award to Martha Graham with the following remarks and I ask unanimous consent that these remarks also be included as well as the acceptance remarks of Miss Martha Graham.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESENTATION OF THE ASPEN AWARD TO MARTHA GRAHAM BY ALVIN C. EURICH, PRESIDENT, ASPEN INSTITUTE FOR HUMANISTIC STUDIES, JULY 30, 1965

First of all, may I express on behalf of this community, the institute, and of thoughtful people with humanistic interests, our heartfelt and deepest gratitude to our chairman and Mrs. Robert O. Anderson for their generous support of the institute and especially, in this technological age, for establishing the Aspen Award in the Humanities. Through their friendship and reaffirmation "of man's dignity and the greatness of the human spirit" our lives are enriched and we are able at times like these to single out and award those exceptionally gifted human souls who have used their genius to give mankind a new sense of direction and greater zest for living.

Today we honor Martha Graham. Shortly after the institute announced that she would receive the 1965 Aspen Award, Lillian

Gish wrote: "As far as I know we, in America, have no undisputed first in the arts, with this one exception in the modern dance, where Martha Graham is the undisputed leader."

The New York Times, in an editorial, approvingly said that "She is without doubt one of the greatest artists America has produced in this era. * * * From the point of view of achievement, influence and use of contemporary materials, she has no superiors and few peers * * * she has used (her art) to probe those dark recesses of man's spirit, the narrow but deep wells of being where the inmost impulses lie." The editorial concluded by putting these words in our mouths: "We honor not alone Martha Graham but America, as well, that nurtured this great figure."

Such considerations were in the minds of the selection board as they chose Martha Graham from hundreds throughout the world whose great achievements were reviewed. She stands preeminent among those "creative persons who are contributing most to the clarification of the individual's role and his relationship to society."

We honor Miss Graham today not solely for her towering achievement in the dance—although that would be reason enough. As Agnes de Mille has observed: "In the most evanescent of all professions (Martha Graham) is regarded, and I believed rightly, as an immortal. Dancers for untold generations will dance differently for her labors. Technically speaking, hers is the single largest contribution in the history of Western dancing."

But we honor her today for something more than technical achievement, however extraordinary. As she herself wrote: "Great art never ignores human values. Therein lies its roots." We esteem her for having chosen this mandate for her art, for having adhered to it faithfully, for having fulfilled it with heroic self-discipline, for having extended it through unparalleled creative fertility, and for having conveyed it to millions of her fellow human beings.

The dance is clearly the first of the arts. We know virtually nothing about how it started. Its primitive beginnings were probably around some tribal fire. But from artifacts, statues, vases, and drawings—the earliest records of man going back to 3000 to 4000 B.C.—we do know that the dance was significant in the lives of primitive peoples.

Clearly from its origins, the dance, more than any other activity, was a humanistic pursuit. For "humanity" means more than one man. The primitive dances brought man, in a physical sense, into a relationship that expressed thoughts of a group. Regardless of the hoped-for effect—whether it was rain, a good crop, protection, or reproduction of the species—the rhythm of the dance was instinctively a group expression of a common goal. These feelings became something which "humanity" could say through the dance. Thus the dance is a means of communication.

Men have long acknowledged the symbolic significance of the dance—first, as a symbol of all the arts which ennoble the human body and spirit, and second, as a symbol of the rhythm of life itself. As Havelock Ellis has written in "The Dance of Life": "The dance lies at the beginning of art, and we find it also at the end. The first creators of civilization were making the dance * * * If we are indifferent to the art of dancing," Ellis concluded, "we have failed to understand, not merely the supreme manifestation of physical life, but also the supreme symbol of spiritual life."

Martha Graham has not just borrowed or built on the entire tradition of artistic and literary expression. In the crucible of her talent she has broken down these images, then reconstituted them in her highly personal but thoroughly communicable style.

She has added a new dimension to the dance. As Lincoln Kirstein has said: "Martha Graham * * * has employed not merely the exotic cultures of the world, nor the vision of a past perfection, but she has, on their foundation, erected a personal classicism and a contemporary expression suitable and equal to her place and time." Through the sheer force of her creative genius and her passionate belief, the critic Robert Sabin has written, "she has forged a dance that leads us to the wellspring of life itself, a dance that is vitally important to every one of us."

For Martha Graham, "every one of us" truly means a worldwide audience of those who are open to the truths of the human spirit which are her themes. Earlier this year the Rockefeller Panel Report on the Performing Arts said: "Perhaps the most renowned modern dance company in the world is Martha Graham's." In the last 15 years her work has reached a world audience. She and her company have toured Europe (1950 and 1954); the Far East, including Java, India, and Iran (1955); the Middle East and Europe (1962); and several times to Israel. Her impact has been enormous: Paul Hoffman, director of the United Nations Special Fund, called her "the greatest ambassador we have ever sent to Asia."

Genuine greatness is never brash, insensitive, rude, or arrogant; instead it reaches out to free and lift man's spirit to new heights; it is never restrictive or confining, it is releasing—always with humility and with a full recognition that there is so much more to be done; that the future of any art, indeed the future of mankind, rests not on past achievements but upon new creations—new forms, new principles, new directions. Such attributes Martha Graham possesses in abundance.

Her creative talents are very much alive today. Just a month ago she returned from Israel—indeed she has virtually been commuting there to direct a dance company. In November she will open on Broadway with new dance creations being composed now by William Schuman and Mordecai Sater. As she has said, "I am not ready to retire yet—I shall dance in the dignity of my time."

Martha Graham has reaffirmed the primacy of the human spirit in an age dominated by science and technology. Drawing her inspiration from many humanistic fields—legends, history, religion, literature, art, archeology, and anthropology—she has found ways to express our deepest thoughts and feelings.

Martha Graham, we meet on this occasion—not adequate to your very great achievements—to recognize the contributions you have made and are making to mankind—including all future generations. And now, on behalf of the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, I am highly honored and inspired to present to you the 1965 Aspen Award in the Humanities with the citation:

To Martha Graham who as a creative dancer, choreographer, and company director has probed deeply those dark recesses of the human spirit and expressed essential truths which have awakened others to a new appreciation of man's nature.

MARTHA GRAHAM ACCEPTANCE SPEECH OF THE ASPEN AWARD

What can I say? You know, I speak without notes because I cannot read and look up and down, and besides I wear glasses, and I am very vain. So, the main thing is, of course, that I can always look into the faces. That's what I can do today, and when I do speak in a theater I always ask that the lights be up enough so that I can see the eyes and the faces of those to whom I'm speaking. After all, they have made my life—they have shared in my life and anything that I have done is a construction really, helped by many, many, many thousands of people.

I love this—I suppose you call it a tent. I love it very much. And it is always in motion. It's mobile, it has none of the terrific rigidity of some theaters. As Mr. Lowry has lead me to believe, in any event, sometimes we get the buildings before we have anything to put into them. And, of course, that is so very tragic and so frustrating for anyone who wants to get into them.

A dancer's life is a strange one. It is not one of complete refusal to live life by any means. Just because I don't have children is no reason why the members of the company can't have children. And they do. They have quite a few, now—12 or something like that within the company. Not on the stage, not yet. I haven't reached the period where I can do the Nutcracker Suite yet. Much as I love it, and I love to go and see it, it is outside my capabilities.

When I was approached by Dr. Eurich in New York, he asked if he could come to see me. He came to my apartment and he told me of this honor. Well, I was completely stunned by this. I could say nothing. And there was one periodical weekly, which is very famous but which must remain nameless, that asked about this and said, "Well, what did you say when you got it?" And I said, "Well, I don't believe I said anything." And the man said, "Well, didn't you say whoopee or anything like that?" I said "No. To begin with, it's a word I never use." And in the face of a sacred honor, such as this is, it would mean nothing. It's not even joy. It is joy, yes, that you experience, but also it is something far more reaching than that. It's a renewal of a commitment.

People have asked me why I chose to be a dancer. I did not choose to be a dancer. I was chosen to be a dancer, and with that you live all your life. When any young student asks me, "Do you think I should be a dancer?" I always say, "If you can ask me that question, no. Only if there is only one way to make life vivid for yourself and for others should you embark upon such a career."

You see, to begin with, it takes about 10 years to produce a dancer. That's not intermittent training; that's daily training. You go step, by step, by step. At 10 years you'll be dancing—probably even before that time—but, by 10 years, if you are going to be a dancer at all, you will have mastered the instrument. You will know the wonders of the human body, because there is nothing more wonderful. The next time you look into the mirror, just look at the way the ears rest next to your head; look at the way the hair line grows; think of the little bones in your wrists; think of the magic of that foot, comparatively small, upon which your whole weight rests. It's a miracle. And the dance in all those areas is a celebration of that miracle. Sometimes, when it's very hot as it was when I left New York, you see these poor creatures standing at the bar, sweating—the hairs all down—they come in looking lovely, and they leave looking rather purified—but in the middle it's very low; very low.

And then, of course, outside your classroom work, there are two areas which you have to embark upon. One is the cultivation of the craft which is in the school where you are working. The other is that something that sometimes is—and has to remain—entirely with you. This is the cultivation of the being from which whatever there is to say comes. It just doesn't come out of nowhere, it comes out of a great curiosity. It comes out of a desire to be an image maker, because that's what imagination means. It means only the ability to make images. But it means the ability to make those images, not as dehumanized things, but as great figures. Take Clytemnestra—that angry, wild, wicked woman. In the ballet that I do, I take her from the end of the third play where she asks, after she is in Hades, "Why do I go dishonored among the dead? Others have killed,

but I go dishonored among the dead." And not until she recognizes the fact that she killed—not out of why she said she killed, which was vengeance for the sacrifice of Iphigenia her daughter, but out of lust for Aegisthus, could she become free to take the branches from Hades and to move.

It cost me a great deal of effort and a great deal of time, and everything and every minute has been treasured. The main thing, of course, always is the fact that there is only one of you in the world—just one. You came from a certain background, you were born at a certain time—a certain instant in the history of the world. And as that, you are unique.

They say every snowflake is different. I can well believe it. But you are unique, and if that is not fulfilled, then something has been lost. Ambition is not enough; necessity is everything.

And when T. S. Eliot says (I may get one word wrong), "It takes a state or condition of complete simplicity costing no less than everything, to produce a perfect art object" * * * to produce something that has the delicacy and vibrancy of a living thing, a piece of jade, a piece of Chinese art, this means that it lives, it pulses, it is alive for hundreds and thousands of years. Even the Luristan things are still alive although we don't understand them.

It has been a great experience to be here, because I was brought up on the west coast and my training was there. Then I went to New York and lived there. But for the first time in years, I have suddenly discovered the West again. I've been reading the Denver Post, which I haven't seen for a long time. And I'm suddenly back again, in even a speech which is familiar to me and, of course, this fabulous, fabulous place. It must be like some of the places in the Himalayas which harbor great thinking and great dedication to life, even with a withdrawal from the activity of life.

And I have nothing more to say except one thing. I have always loved St. John Pearse for giving me this line, which is in one of his poems. "We have so little time to be born to this instant."

Thank you.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Monday, August 16, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 13, 1965:

U.S. MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

To be brigadier generals

Wallace H. Robinson, Earl E. Anderson Jr.
Michael P. Ryan
Virgil W. Banning, Frank E. Garretson

COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORP.

William W. Hagerty, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the board of directors of the Communications Satellite Corp. for the remainder of the term expiring at the date of the annual meeting of the corporation in 1967.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning George E. Palmer to be major, and ending Jackson M. Yielding, Jr., to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 5, 1965.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, AUGUST 16, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this verse of Scripture: Exodus 33: 15: *If Thy presence go not with us, carry us not up hence.*

Eternal God, our Father, whose mercy and love we have as our hope, may we not be careless of the inheritance of inspiration, which those who have gone before have left us.

We give Thee thanks for our comrades and fellow workers who share with us Thy blessings, and we adore Thy name with all who seek to serve Thy holy will in faithfulness and joy.

As Thou dost look into the chambers and corners of our hearts mayest Thou find there a profound and deep hunger urging us on and strengthening and sustaining us in a way of life that is heroic and dedicated.

Grant that as we daily struggle and aspire for truth, love, and righteousness may the division and the broken ties of humanity be woven into an eternal communion and the hurt and heartaches of mankind shall be healed.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of Thursday, August 12, 1965, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 206. An act to provide a realistic cost-of-living increase in rates of subsistence allowances paid to disabled veterans pursuing vocational rehabilitation training;

H.R. 208. An act to amend chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, to extend to seriously disabled veterans the same liberalization of time limits for pursuing vocational rehabilitation training as was authorized for blinded veterans by Public Law 87-591, and to clarify the language of the law relating to the limiting of periods for pursuing such training;

H.R. 3037. An act to amend section 1485 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the transportation of remains of deceased dependents of members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3044. An act to authorize payment of incentive pay for the performance of hazardous duty on the flight deck of an aircraft carrier;

H.R. 5034. An act to amend section 2575(a) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the disposition of lost, abandoned, or unclaimed personal property under certain conditions;

H.R. 7181. An act to provide for the commemoration of certain historical events in the State of Kansas, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7595. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize transportation at Government expense for dependents accompanying members of the uniformed services at their posts of duty outside the United States, who require medical care not locally available;

H.R. 7843. An act to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to authorize the survivors of a member of the Armed Forces who dies while on active duty to be paid for his unused accrued leave;

H.R. 10139. An act to amend the act of June 23, 1949, relating to the telephone and telegraph service furnished Members of the House of Representatives;

H.R. 10306. An act to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1951, as amended;

H.J. Res. 95. Joint resolution to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by Sanford Dam, Canadian River project, Texas, as "Lake Meredith"; and

H.J. Res. 431. Joint resolution extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 89. An act to authorize establishment of the Delaware Valley National Recreation Area, and for other purposes;

H.R. 205. An act to amend chapter 35 of title 38 of the United States Code in order to increase the educational assistance allowances payable under the war orphans' educational assistance program, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3329. An act to incorporate the Youth Councils on Civic Affairs, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5280. An act to provide for exemptions from the antitrust laws to assist in safeguarding the balance of payments position of the United States;

H.R. 5519. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize language training to be given to a dependent of a member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps under certain circumstances; and

H.R. 9947. An act to amend the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1959, to provide for reimbursement of transportation expenses for Members of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7969. An act to correct certain errors in the Tariff Schedules of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. BENNETT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 8639. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agen-

cies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. MUNDT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 322. An act for the relief of Choy-Sim Mah;

S. 343. An act for the relief of Paride Marchesan;

S. 505. An act for the relief of Darlyne Marie Cecile Fisher Every;

S. 782. An act for the relief of Anna Ungvari;

S. 1397. An act for the relief of Vasileos Koutsougeanopoulos;

S. 1647. An act for the relief of Kim Sung Jin;

S. 1651. An act for the relief of Dr. Augustine Y. M. Yao;

S. 1678. An act for the relief of Guillermo Macalintal Madrigal;

S. 1736. An act for the relief of Jennifer Ellen Johnson Mojara;

S. 1748. An act for the relief of Virgilio Acosta-Martinez;

S. 1775. An act for the relief of Erich Gansmuller;

S. 1919. An act for the relief of Laura MacArthur Godtliabois-Deacon;

S. 2150. An act to discontinue or modify certain reporting requirements of law;

S. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 198 entitled "The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations";

S. Con. Res. 45. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the "Catalog of Federal Aids to State and Local Governments" and the 1965 supplement thereto; and

S. Con. Res. 49. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 81) entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to apportion the sum authorized for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, for the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways."

The message further announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," had appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate for the Disposition of Executive Papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 66-2.

THE LATE HONORABLE GRACIE PFOST

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House